DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 224 TE 002 867

AUTHOR	Ahrens, Nyla Herber
TITLE	Censorship and the Teacher of English: A Questionnaire Survey of a Selected Sample of Secondary School Teachers of English.
PUB DATE	65
NOTE	146p.; unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*Censorship; Communication (Thought Transfer); Course Content; Curriculum Design; *English Instruction; *Instructional Materials; Literature; Objectives; Parents; Public Schools; *Questionnaires; *Secondary School Teachers; Surveys; Task Performance; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Characteristics; Textbooks; Values

ABSTRACT

A study designed to provide a systematic description of the incidence of censorship and the censorship incidents reported by a selected group of teachers during a specified time period is presented. Objectives are: (1) to provide some measure of the frequency of censorship incidents experienced by a sample population of teachers of English, and (2) to describe the incidents. Censorship is defined as the withholding of a cmmunication from one person to another. This study focuses on that form of censorship which proscribes or restricts the use of specific books in the public secondary school English curriculum. The censorship pressures to be described are those put upon the teacher of English as he considers, recommends, selects, or uses works of literature and other pertinent books in his professional capacity. Conclusions include: (1) English teachers who were the object of censorship pressures were objects because they were doing a good job of teaching English; (2) Those teachers who reported censorship experience often were ones who used practices which supposedly help to prevent censorship attempts; (3) In half of the instances reported, the would-be censors were parents; and (4) The major burden of defense against censorship must be carried by the teacher. (CK)

ED 061 224

CENSORSHIP AND THE TEACHER OF ENGLISH:
A QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY OF A SELECTED SAMPLE OF SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS OF ENGLISH

Nyla Herber Ahrens

TE 002 867

From the library of the

NCTE

508 South Sixth Street Champaign, Illinois

THESIS

2

ED 061 224

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CENSORSHIP AND THE TEACHER OF ENGLISH: A QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY OF A SELECTED SAMPLE OF SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS OF ENGLISH

by

Nyla Herber Ahrens

This project was done under the supervision of:

Professor Louis Forsdale, Sponsor
Professor Robert E. Shafer

Approved by the Committee on the Degree of Doctor of Education

Date__________________________

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education in
Teachers College, Columbia University

1965

TE 002 867

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Nyla Herber Ahrens

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Purpose of the Study 1

Need for the Study 2

Assumptions. 2

Definitions. 3

Censorship 3

Censor 4

Limitations of the Study 4

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 6

III. PROCEDURES 20

Questionnaire Pre-Test 20

Questionnaire Construction 21

Universe and Sample. 22

Questionnaire Distribution and Response. 23

Population Responding. 23

Summary of Responses 25

IV. FINDINGS: CENSORSHIP--THE CONTEXT. 26

The Teachers 27

Highest degree or equivalent 27

Recency of training. 27

Type of training institution 30

Major subject studied. 30

Experience in teaching English 33

CHAPTER PAGE

Length of service in present position 33

Grade level of present English teaching assignment. . 36

Teacher's self-description. 36

Comparison of self-description with community description 39

The Community 39

Type of community 39

Size of community 39

Description of community. 43

Amount of public criticism of local schools 43

Subject of public criticism of local schools. 43

Curricular area of textbooks criticized by public . . 47

Criticisms of textbooks by public 47

The School. 50

School enrollment 50

School curricula. 50

School policy in regard to public complaints about textbooks 53

Material used by teachers 56

Selection of textbookx. 56

Selection of required or recommended readings 59

Teachers' freedom to determine course content 59

Teachers' freedom to determine teaching methods . . . 62

Teachers' freedom to select instructional materials . 62

V. FINDINGS: CENSORSHIP--INCIDENCE AND INCIDENTS

Incidence 65

Incidents 66

CHAPTER PAGE

The censored books 66
Censored books most frequently cited 68
Date of publication, nationality of author of censored books 68
Inclusion of censored books in recommended reading lists. 69
Objectors. 69
Recipient of report of objection 69
Method of reporting objection. 71
Reason for objecting 71
Objections, by objectors 71
Use of censored books. 76
Grade levels where censored books were being used. . 76
Selection of censored books. 76
Form of censored books 76
Outcomes of censorship incidents 76
Comparison of incidents, by outcome. 81
Some Specific Cases. 83
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS. 86
Summary. 88
Conclusions. 91
BIBLIOGRAPHY 100
APPENDIX A. Covering Letter and Questionnaire Used in Pre-Test 110
APPENDIX B. Covering Letter and Questionnaire Used in Survey 116
APPENDIX C. Follow-Up Letter Used in Survey 121

CHAPTER PAGE

APPENDIX D. Table XXXVII: Incidence of Censorship, By States . 122

APPENDIX E. Table XXXVIII: Censored Books--Number of Objections, Objectors, Reasons for Objecting. . . 125

APPENDIX F. Table XXXIX: Books Objected To--Date of Publication, Nationality of Author. 131

APPENDIX G. Table XXXX: Censored Books--Inclusion in Recommended Reading Lists 134

APPENDIX H. Categories Used in Coding Question 28, Listed With Original Responses 137

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

I. Highest Degree or Equivalent Credits Reported 28

II. Date of Completion of Highest Degree. 29

III. Type of Institution Granting Highest Degree 31

IV. Major Subject Studied for Highest Degree. 32

V. Years of Experience Teaching English. 34

VI. Length of Service in Present Position 35

VII. Grade Level Teaching Assignment in English. 37

VIII. Self-Description in Terms of Political and Social Issues 38

IX. Comparison of Self-Description and Community Description in Regard to Political and Social Issues. 40

X. Type of Community in Which School is Located. 41

XI. Size of Community in Which School is Located. 42

XII. Description of Community in Regard to Social and Political Issues. 44

XIII. Amount of Public Criticism of Local Schools 45

XIV. Subject of Public Criticism of Local Schools. 46

XV. Curricular Area of Textbooks Criticized by Public . . . 48

XVI. Criticisms of Textbooks by Public 49

XVII. Size of School Enrollment 51

XVIII. Curricula Provided in School. 52

XIX. Existence of School Policy or Procedures for Dealing With Public Complaints About Textbooks. 54

XX. Materials Used by Teachers in English Courses 57

XXI. Method of Selecting Textbooks 58

TABLE PAGE

XXII. Method of Selecting Required and/or Recommended Readings Used in Addition to Textbooks. 60

XXIII. Degree of Freedom to Determine Course Content Reported by Teachers. 61

XXIV. Degree of Freedom to Determine Teaching Methods Reported by Teachers. 63

XXV. Degree of Freedom to Select Instructional Materials Reported by Teachers. 64

XXVI. Incidence of Censorship, by Regions 67

XXVII. Censorship Incidents: The Objectors 70

XXVIII. Censorship Incidents: Person to Whom Incidents Were Reported 72

XXIX. Censorship Incidents: Methods Used by Objector to Report Objections 73

XXX. Censorship Incidents: Reasons Given for Objecting to Books. 74

XXXI. Objections, by Objectors. 75

XXXII. Censorship Incidents: Use of Censored Books 77

XXXIII. Censorship Incidents: Grade Levels on Which Censored Books Were Used. 78

XXXIV. Censorship Incidents: Selection of Censored Books . . . 79

XXXV. Censorship Incidents: Outcomes. 80

XXXVI. Censorship Incidents: Outcomes, By Person to Whom Objections Were Reported. 82

XXXVII. Incidence of Censorship, by States. 122

XXXVIII. Censored Books: Number of Objections, Objectors, Reasons for Objecting 125

XXIX. Censored Books: Date of Publication, Nationality of Author 131

XXXX. Censored Books: Inclusion in Recommended Reading Lists 134

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In 1962, for the second time in less than a decade, the National Council of Teachers of English issued an official publication on the subject of censorship. The authors of The Students' Right to Read declare that "across America today increasing pressures are exerted on schools to restrict the access of students to important and worthwhile books. In many communities attempts have been made to remove literary works from classrooms and school libraries."[1] Their conviction that "book censorship threatens to become a widespread problem for schools"[2] was reflected not only in further Council publications and programs during 1962-64, but also in those of other groups within and outside the educational community.

Purpose of the Study

This study was designed to provide a systematic description of the incidence of censorship and the censorship incidents reported by a selected group of teachers during a specified time period. The first purpose was to provide some measure of the frequency of censorship incidents experienced by a sample population of teachers of English in public secondary schools during the two academic years (1962-63, 1963-64) following publication of The Students' Right to Read. The second, although not secondary, purpose was to describe the censorship incidents by describing: (1) the teachers involved, (2) the school and community contexts, (3) the would-be censors, (4) the books in question, their selection and use, and (5) the actual episodes, from original complaint to final resolution.

---

[1] National Council of Teachers of English, Committee on the Right to Read, The Students' Right to Read, Champaign, Illinois, The Council, 1962, p. 5.

[2] Ibid., p. 13.

Need for the Study

"Before much progress can be made in solving problems, men must possess accurate descriptions of the phenomena with which they work."[1] Descriptive research traditionally has been, and should be, undertaken to provide a basis for making intelligent plans and decisions in regard to problems in the field of education. However, despite the often reiterated belief that book censorship is one of the most serious and significant problems facing the contemporary teacher of English, neither the National Council of Teachers of English nor anyone else has made a formal assessment of the situation, except in a limited or unstructured way. It is hoped that the data obtained in this study will serve as a better basis for further thought, research, and action on the part of individual English teachers, their professional associations and training institutions, and other groups and individuals concerned about the threat of censorship to schools today.

Assumptions

In the belief that the investigator's own convictions or assumptions regarding the subject of this study should be made known, they are stated in very general terms as follows: (1) freedom of communication is the basis of a free and democratic society and should be maintained, and (2) censorship is a restriction or abrogation of this freedom and should be opposed. More specifically, it is assumed that: (1) education for citizenship in a democratic society should be conducted within an atmosphere of freedom, (2) students should be exposed to and have free access to a wide range of ideas and experiences, and (3) competent teachers should be free, within legal and financial limits, to select from an unrestricted range of resources those materials which they deem to be most appropriate for their professional purposes. Any attempt made to limit or deny these freedoms should be resisted.

---

[1] Deobold B. Van Dalen, Understanding Educational Research: An Introduction, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962, p. 184.

Definitions

Censorship. In the broadest sense of the term, "Censorship is the withholding of a communication from one person by another."[1] This study focuses on that form of censorship which proscribes or restricts the use of specific books in the public secondary school English curriculum. Although pre-publication censorship pressure upon textbook publishers is a problem which should be of grave concern to educators, it was not considered in this survey. The censorship pressures to be described are those put upon the teacher of English as he considers, recommends, selects, or uses works of literature and other pertinent books in his professional capacity.

---

[1] Owen Love, "Censorship--Whether and Why," Draft of a memorandum for the National Education Association, Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities, January 15, 1964, p. 1.

Although the process of selecting some books necessarily involves rejecting others, selection should not be confused with censorship. From the point of view of this study, selection is seen as an essentially positive act involving the use of professional criteria and procedures; censorship as essentially negative and involving non-professional standards and methods.

Censor. A censor is one who censors and, in this context, one who attempts to prevent the adoption or continued use of some particular book or books in the English curriculum. Such a censor may be either a lay citizen or an educator: a parent, clergyman, representative of a local or national organization, principal, superintendent, member of the board of education--even another teacher.

Limitations of the Study

The central purpose of a descriptive survey is to discover "what is"; to become familiar with and depict for others the present status of some phenomenon. Since this ordinarily is the first form of research undertaken on any problem, the surveyor cannot predict with any certainty the value of his research; neither can he know for sure what questions to ask nor which will prove to be most significant. Certainly in this study there is no claim that the questions were comprehensive. Responses to each portion of the survey instrument suggested additional questions which could have been asked.

Secondly, the questions dealt only with relatively objective, easily describable experience. There was no attempt to investigate the more subtle forms and results of censorship pressures on teachers of English. In addition, the use of closed form questions restricted both the quantity and quality of responses. Even with the provision of an open form "other" category in many instances, respondents had no real opportunity to expand on their answers.

The particular population employed also should be considered a limitation. The universe from which the sample was drawn was one part of the membership of a professional association, the Secondary Section of the National Council of Teachers of English. Any generalizations made on the basis of sample findings cannot be extended--without reservations--beyond that universe to the larger population of United States secondary school teachers of English as a whole. Council headquarters staff members have said that their geographical membership patterns probably are not representative of the country's English teacher population. Borg suggests that "there may be a tendency for the more competent members of the professional group to belong to the organization."[1] Whatever they may be, there do appear to be differences between English teachers who are members of the National Council of Teachers of English and those who are not, as evidenced by some of the findings of the recent Council Study, The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English.[2]

---

[1] Walter R. Borg, Educational Research: An Introduction, New York, David McKay Company, Inc., 1963, p. 210.

[2] National Council of Teachers of English, Committee on the National Interest, The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English, Champaign, Illinois, The Council, 1964, 192 p.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In 1960, Downs noted that "a quick survey of American and British writings since 1900 revealed over 1200 periodical articles and in excess of 100 books dealing directly with literary censorship."[1] A reference librarian in Oklahoma examined twenty-three years of Library Literature "to discover how much literature on censorship is being published in that profession."[2] Library Literature is the most comprehensive indexing service in the library field, and indexes a great amount of material that appears in non-library literature. Since 1940, both the number and the percentage of "censorship citations" (in relation to the total citations) have risen fairly steadily to a high of 568 books, pamphlets, and articles on censorship cited in 1961-63.[3]

As these data suggest, in making a search of the literature the initial problem was that of focusing upon fairly specific aspects of the broad subject of censorship. Three successive steps in the process of narrowing the focus included concentration, first, upon book censorship alone (as opposed to censorship in relation to all forms of print, or to all forms of communication); then on book censorship only in relation to schools, and to secondary schools in particular; and finally on school book censorship on the secondary level only as it involved books used in the English curriculum.

---

[1] Robert B. Downs, ed., The First Freedom: Liberty and Justice in the World of Books and Reading, Chicago, American Library Association, 1960, p. xii.

[2] Jerome B. Simpson, "Censorship: The Profession's Response," Newsletter on Intellectual Freedom, 13:41-2, July 1964.

[3] *Loc. cit.*

The search also focused for the most part on material published since 1953. It was in 1953 that the National Council of Teachers of English issued its first official publication on the subject, Censorship and Controversy,[1] in response to a wave of attacks on teachers and textbooks following World War II. At this time the most common charge made against the schools and school materials was that of "un-Americanism"[2]; a hunt was on for Communists and Communist influence in the schools and colleges of the country. Social Studies was a more frequent target than the field of English, but the Council felt that even though "the number of instances in which a particular book, film, recording, or other instructional material has been banned directly from use in the English classrooms of the nation [was] relatively few,"[3] there was sufficient cause for concern.

The initial stages of the search utilized the standard library tools for this purpose: cumulative book and periodical indexes; reports of research completed and in progress; lists of dissertations and projects. Later, three days were spent at the headquarters of the National Council of Teachers of English in Champaign, Illinois, discussing the problem of censorship with members of the headquarters staff, and going through both their library and their files on the subject. During a subsequent visit to the headquarters of the Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities of the National Education Association in Washington, there was a similar opportunity to make a search of their files as well as to interview members of their staff. Relevant files and publications also were made available at the office of the then Assistant Managing Director of the American Book Publisher's Council, Peter Jennison, and at the offices of the New York Civil Liberties Union and the American Civil Liberties Union in New York City. It was not possible to make a visit to the American Library Association headquarters, but the writer was an invited participant in the Association's conference on censorship which was attended by their national officers and state chairmen of Intellectual Freedom Committees from all over the country, as well as by representatives of a great range of organizations concerned with questions of censorship and freedom to read. Despite these opportunities to conduct an extensive search, few systematic studies of any kind related to schoolbook censorship were discovered. Exhortation rather than investigation typified the relevant publications.

---

[1] National Council of Teachers of English, Committee on Censorship of Teaching Materials for Classroom and Library, Censorship and Controversy, Chicago, The Council, 1953, 56 p.

[2] Mary Anne Raywid, The Ax-Grinders: Critics of Our Public Schools, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1962, p. 69.

[3] National Council of Teachers of English, Committee on Censorship of Teaching Materials for Classroom and Library, op. cit., p. 51.

The Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities[1] of the National Education Association sought information about textbook censorship in its last two surveys of the "State of the Nation in Regard to Criticisms of the Schools and Problems of Concern to Teachers."[2]

---

[1] Formerly known as the Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education.

[2] National Education Association, Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education, "State of the Nation in Regard to Criticisms

These surveys, four of which have been conducted since 1955, were "not technical research jobs." They were prepared for the information of Commission consultants and officers of local and state educational organizations, not for publication or general distribution.[1] Questionnaires were sent to a large number of educators--leaders of local and state groups--and in many cases their responses reflected the opinions of members of their groups as well as their own. The response rate in 1961 was 23 per cent (1801 questionnaires); in 1963 it was 19 per cent (2300 questionnaires). Both questions and answer categories have been changed from survey to survey. Despite these limitations, the survey reports contain interesting data and some of the questions served as the bases for items in the questionnaires designed for this study.

The area of textbook criticism was covered for the first time in the 1961 survey, included again in 1963. In the reports of these two surveys, approximately the same percentage of respondents reported that there was "much" destructive criticism in their school districts (15 per cent in the report published in 1961; 16 per cent in 1963).[2] The most frequently reported subject of destructive criticism in both surveys was school costs; texts and reference books were listed as

---

of the Schools and Problems of Concern to Teachers," State of the Nation Bulletin No. 3, Washington, D.C., The Commission, January 1961, 8 p., Multilithed. Hereafter cited as State of the Nation Bulletin No. 3; National Education Association, Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities, "State of the Nation in Regard to Criticisms of the Schools and Problems of Concern to Teachers," State of the Nation Bulletin No. 4, Washington, D.C., The Commission, February 1963, 11 p., Multilithed. Hereafter cited as State of the Nation Bulletin No. 4.

[1] "State of the Nation Bulletin No. 4," p. 1.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 2.

eleventh in frequency in 1960.[1] It is difficult to compare this with the 1962 survey since the answer categories were changed, but of four general categories of most frequent complaints in the later report, "textbooks, curriculum, and materials" came third.[2]

When asked if there had been any criticisms of the textbooks used in their school system during the previous year, 21 per cent replied "yes" in 1960, 39 per cent in 1962. (61 per cent said "no" in 1960; 30 per cent in 1962.)[3] The types of textbooks criticized in these two periods were categorized differently, but in both cases books related to the teaching of English came fourth on the list. In 1960, Mathematics led the list, followed by Social Studies and Science; in 1962, Social Studies was first, with History and Mathematics following.[4]

The most frequently mentioned criticism of textbooks in both reports was that they were out of date. "The second most frequent charge in 1960 was that the material was not adequately covered. In 1962 this charge dropped to sixth place, preceded by charges of having communist leanings, not being patriotic enough, being too easy, and being socialistic."[5] The source of these criticisms reported most often in 1960 was teachers, themselves, with parents second, followed by school administrators and other citizens. In 1962 parents took the lead, followed by teachers and then other citizens.[6]

The result of the criticisms was that, in 1961, 31 per cent of the books were kept in use, 17 per cent removed; in 1963, 49 per cent were kept, 15 per cent removed. (In both instances, the remaining situations were still "under study.")[1]

---

[1] "State of the Nation Bulletin No. 3," p. 4.

[2] "State of the Nation Bulletin No. 4," p. 3.

[3] _Ibid_., p. 7.

[4] _Loc_. _cit_.

[5] _Loc_. _cit_.

[6] _Ibid_., p. 7, 8.

These surveys--even though they violate many of the basic tenets of descriptive research--provide the only data available on a nationwide basis and over any span of time. On the other hand, the study which was most carefully designed and conducted is the one which is least directly relevant. Marjorie Fiske's Book Selection and Censorship[2] is a report of an investigation of librarians in both public and school libraries in California, conducted in 1956-58. A study of practices in regard to book selection and circulation involving 204 interviews with librarians in 26 communities, its major finding was the amount of self-censorship or pre-censorship on the part of librarians.

In regard to school libraries, the majority of objectors to controversial books came from within the school system: librarians, 42 per cent; administrative personnel, 23 per cent. Third on the list of objectors came parents (18 per cent), followed by teachers (8 per cent).[3] "Politics" was the grounds for objection to books in school libraries in 29 per cent of the situations; "sex and obscenity" totaled 28 per cent.[4] The largest group of patron and parental complaints reported for all libraries (50 per cent) involved morals and profanity.[5]

---

[1] "State of the Nation Bulletin, No. 4," p. 8.

[2] Marjorie Fiske, Book Selection and Censorship: A Study of School and Public Libraries in California, Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1959, 145 p.

[3] Ibid., p. 123. [4] Loc. cit.

[5] Ibid., p. 46.

Two investigations dealt directly with censorship of printed materials used in the teaching of English, each concerned with a particular state. In the Spring of 1963, after publication of The Students' Right to Read, the National Council of Teachers of English asked their affiliated local councils of English teachers to devote portions of their Spring programs to consideration of the issues and proposals outlined in that pamphlet. Only twelve affiliate groups reported their programs, and--with two exceptions--these reports indicated that the participants felt little or no censorship pressure themselves and were unaware of any measurable degree of such pressure in their schools or communities.[1]

One of the exceptions was the report of the Censorship Roundup Committee of the Utah Council of Teachers of English which had sent a questionnaire to the English Department Chairmen in the 79 high schools and 81 junior high schools in Utah. They received a 67 per cent response from the former; 20 per cent from the latter.[2] "Thirty per cent of the schools responding . . . reported definite incidents and a number of others reported 'minor skirmishes.'"[3] "Most of the incidents mentioned involved parents as individuals rather than as a group. Next came PTA groups and last, the community groups . . ."[4]

---

[1] Unpublished letters and memoranda in the files of the National Council of Teachers of English, Champaign, Illinois.

[2] Utah Council of Teachers of English, "Report of the Censorship Roundup Committee," Unpublished document in the files of the National Council of Teachers of English, Champaign, Illinois, unpaged.

[3] "Affiliates Study the Censorship Issues," National Council of Teachers of English," Council-Grams, 25:14, September 10, 1963.

[4] Utah Council of Teachers of English, op. cit.

The Wisconsin Council of Teachers of English also sponsored a state-wide study, this one conducted by Lee A. Burress, Jr., Chairman of the English Department at Wisconsin State College.[1] In February 1963, Burress sent copies of a brief "Questionnaire Concerning Censorship Pressures on Wisconsin Teachers" to 914 public school administrators (from whom he received a 47 per cent response) and to 724 public school teachers (25 per cent of whom responded). Teachers were asked to report their own censorship experience; administrators, their own experience and that of teachers in their schools.

"Approximately a fifth of all the returns reported a specific request to remove a book or magazine from use or from a recommended list during the two years prior to the study. . . . Approximately one-third of all the returns contained evidence of one sort or another supporting the major conclusion that a substantial proportion of the teachers in Wisconsin feel the continuing presence of censorship pressures, and have experienced, or expect to experience, an overt expression of that pressure."[2] "Despite the high frequency of occurrence of censorship incidents, however, only 17 per cent of the schools were reported as having policies for dealing with the problem of censorship."[3]

Burress, in his report, defined censorship as "the use of non-professional standards for accepting or rejecting a book."[4] In describing his findings, he noted several non-professional characteristics of the would-be censors: "evaluation of a book based on a single episode or aspect, taken out of context"; "objection to the language"; "objection based on the ideas contained in the books"; "unwillingness to act in public ways."[1]

---

[1] Lee A. Burress, Jr., How Censorship Affects the School, Wisconsin Council of Teachers of English, Special Bulletin No. 8, Oshkosh, The Council, October 1963, 23 p.

[2] Ibid., p. 2.

[3] Ibid., p. 7.

[4] Ibid., p. 3.

This use of non-professional standards and methods for judging school books characterized many of the groups described in two recent studies of pressures on the schools: The Ax-Grinders: Critics of our Public Schools, by Raywid, and The Censors and the Schools, by Nelson and Roberts.[2] The Raywid book, based upon her doctoral dissertation, is an investigation of the "illegitimate" critics of public education in the United States, in most cases ultra-right-wing political and economic radicals.[3] She notes that there was a "lull in demands for teacher investigation and textbook censorship" during the mid-fifties; the last major textbook "evaluation" effort died in 1953.[4] However, the late fifties brought a resurgence. In 1959, the Textbook Evaluation Committee of the organization known as America's Future began operations; by June of 1960 they already had reviewed fifty books.[5] "This Committee came into being because of much evidence of socialist and other propaganda in textbooks currently in our public schools,"[6] and works to provide--without cost--"objective evaluations" of textbooks to anyone interested. The Social Studies are their primary concern, but they also have reviewed English texts, looking for evidence of undesirable "liberalism."

---

[1] Lee A. Burress, Jr., How Censorship Affects the School, Wisconsin Council of Teachers of English, Special Bulletin No. 8, Oshkosh, The Council, October 1963, p. 4, 5.

[2] Mary Ann Raywid, The Ax-Grinders: Critics of our Public Schools, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1962, 260 p; Jack Nelson and Gene Roberts, Jr., The Censors and the Schools, Boston, Little, Brown and Company, 1963, 208 p.

[3] Raywid, op. cit., book jacket. [4] Ibid., p. 123. [5] Ibid., p. 125.

[6] This statement appears on the cover sheet attached to "Textbook Evaluation Reports" prepared by the Textbook Evaluation Committee of America's Future, Inc.

Nelson and Roberts, both newspapermen, also were concerned about the activities of America's Future and those of other groups--primarily of the right-wing--who work toward censorship of textbooks. They, too, felt that there had been an upswing in censorship activities in recent years. "In nearly a third of our state legislatures, textbooks came under fire from the early part of 1958 until the end of 1962. Censorship groups stepped up their activities in 1961 and 1962. Their successes, coupled with the proliferation of right-wing groups to distribute their propaganda and to join in their attacks on books, portended even more activities for 1963 and after."[1]

In this book, they directed attention to what they perceived to be organized and successful attempts by ultraconservative groups to influence--by direct and indirect pressures on publishers and legislators--the contents as well as the selection of textbooks. The textbooks and library books involved were, again, most often from the Social Studies. However, one of the major forces in these activities, the Daughters of the American Revolution, included English texts in its "Textbook Study,"[2] evaluating them on the basis of their patriotism or subversiveness. In addition to attacking books because they contain

---

[1] Jack Nelson and Gene Roberts, Jr., The Censors and the Schools, Boston, Little, Brown and Company, 1963, p. 20.

[2] National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, National Defense Committee, "Textbook Study 1958-59," Washington, D.C., The Society, n.d., 20 p.

"controversial" material, or do not approach a subject from the point of view of the censor, Nelson and Roberts' reports pointed up two other non-professional grounds for censorship frequently used by these groups: the undesirable present or past affiliations of the author, and the similarly undesirable affiliations of authors listed in bibliographies or suggested for collateral reading.

The March 1962 issue of the American Book Publishers Council's Freedom-to-Read Bulletin was devoted to a review of "Attacks on Books in U.S. Schools During 1961," and reported specific incidents in eighteen states.[1] Peter Jennison, the editor at that time, was convinced that the most "far-reaching" activities against books during 1961 were in the area of school books--"particularly the 20th century classics"--and that "administrators [were] often reluctant to do battle in behalf of their library and classroom use."[2] He noted, however, that in the incidents cited, "when educators and the ancillary boards of education [stood] firm in defense of the professionally guided use of such books, the opposition usually [subsided] quickly."[3]

Referring to some of the groups studied by Raywid and Nelson and Roberts, he said that those "veterans' groups and venerable-lineage societies" were still major forces in attacking textbooks and had been joined by other groups, such as the White Citizens Council and the John Birch Society, all of them concerned about the communistic leanings of textbook authors and their writing. But, "with the advancing use of lower priced paperbound books in school, particularly in English and Social Studies classes, those who oppose their use . . . are most often a handful of parents or conservative ministers or both." Their accusation is one "more highly charged emotionally," that of "obscenity."[1] Much this same point was made by Strout in a slightly earlier article: ". . . parental targets are, for the most part, the trade books which are on 'required reading' lists--or just simply school library shelves. While the target of pressure groups and legislators is usually political content, the parents' watchful eye is on the moral content--the 'frankness' of the book. . ."[2] "Immorality" and "obscenity" were the charges most frequently made against Catcher in the Rye which Jennison noted in Fall 1963 "now has the dubious honor of being the most consistently damned book in this country's public school systems."[3]

---

[1] American Book Publishers Council, Inc., Freedom-to-Read Bulletin, 5:1-12, March 1962, Entire issue.

[2] Ibid., p. 1.

[3] Ibid., p. 2.

The authors cited thus far were not the only ones alarmed by the nature and scope of schoolbook censorship activities during the late fifties and early sixties. While the general public may have appeared largely apathetic or unaware of the situation, as charged by Jennison in his 1963 publication, Freedom to Read,[4] a number of organizations produced programs and publications on the subject of schoolbook censorship during the period 1962-64. Among these groups were:

---

[1] American Book Publishers Council, Inc., Freedom-to-Read Bulletin, 5:2, March 1962.

[2] Donald E. Strout, "Intellectual Freedom Landmarks: 1955-60," Reprinted from the Library Journal, June 1 and August 1961 issues. Unpaged.

[3] American Book Publishers Council, Inc., Freedom-to-Read Bulletin, 6:8, Fall 1963.

[4] Peter Jennison, Freedom to Read, Public Affairs Pamphlet No. 344, New York, Public Affairs Committee, 1963, 20 p.

American Library Association; American Civil Liberties Union; National Education Association; American Book Publishers Council; and the National Council of Jewish Women. During this same period, both the National Education Association and the American Association of School Administrators devoted annual convention program time to discussions of censorship in the schools, and the entire 1963 Conference sponsored by the Freedom of Information Center was devoted to "The Contemporary Encroachment on the Students' Right to Read." In addition to publishing The Students' Right to Read, the National Council of Teachers of English during the same period held Convention programs, passed resolutions, published articles in its journals and newsletter, sent speakers to meetings around the country, and tried to fill requests for help and information from teachers and administrators involved in local censorship incidents.

A review of all of this material led to the conclusion that these groups believed: (a) that there was a problem, (b) that schoolbook censorship incidents were occurring with distressing frequency, and (c) that both professional educators and laymen should be awakened to take action to check the further spread of censorship. However, little if any new information was provided; the publications and speeches reviewed and rehashed newspaper reports of specific incidents or provided undocumented descriptions of the general situation. For the most part, they consisted of warnings, exhortations, resolutions, and programs of action to deal with censorship threats.

Based on what little research there was to be found, and upon the wealth of opinion and impressionistic data located in the search of the literature since 1953, the following summary impressions remained:

Schoolbook censorship goes in cycles, as do other forms of censorship and other forms of criticism of the schools. The end of the fifties and the early sixties were marked by an upsurge in such censorship. Textbooks were not the most common subject of complaint about the schools, but they ranked high; Social Studies outranked English as the subject matter of textbooks receiving most criticism. Pressure groups were concerned most with the political content, specifically the "anti-Americanism" or "liberalism" of books used in the schools, particularly textbooks. Parents were more concerned about the morality, obscenity, and language of the trade books which were on reading lists or in the library. There was, in addition, a good deal of internal censorship by school and library personnel that eliminated books before they ever reached the hands of the student reader.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

Questionnaire Pre-Test

A first draft of the questionnaire was prepared following the search of available literature on the subject and interviews with people actively involved in dealing with schoolbook censorship problems. Revisions were made based upon criticisms from consultants and colleagues, and a final draft duplicated for use in a pilot survey. A copy of the questionnaire, covering letter, and evaluation sheet (see Appendix A, pages 110-115) were mailed to each member of the New York State 1963-64 Academic Year Institute conducted by the Department of English and Foreign Languages, Teachers College, Columbia University. All of the Institute members were professional teachers of English, with from two to twenty years of experience in the field, and all were employed in full time teaching positions at the time of the pilot survey.

Thirty-six questionnaires were sent out; twenty-six were returned, for a 72.2 per cent response. In carrying out the pre-test, it was not assumed that the returns would serve as accurate predictors of either the percentage or the patterns of response which might be expected in the actual study. Rather, the pre-test was conducted to aid in the further refinement of questionnaire items and proved to be most helpful in this regard. That some questions were misleading or ambiguous was immediately made evident by the answers they elicited. Further evidence of ambiguity came from the comments made by respondents on the evaluation page and from their compliance with the investigator's request to place an "x" by any items which seemed unclear or confusing.

The pilot responses were of assistance in at least two other ways as well. In the final questionnaire, as the number of open form questions was reduced, pilot responses helped to provide possible categories for response when items were changed from open to closed form. Second, the respondents' estimates of time required for completion of the pilot questionnaire aided in determining the length of the final version.

Questionnaire Construction

On the basis of the pilot responses, further consultation, and additional reading, a final revision of the questionnaire was prepared. The length, format, and type of question (primarily closed form) were designed to keep the time and effort required of the respondent to a minimum. Pilot study participants had indicated that the draft questionnaire required from three to fifteen minutes to complete; it was estimated that the final questionnaire would require an average of ten minutes.

A significant difference between the pilot study and the actual investigation was that the word "censorship" was not used anywhere in either the final questionnaire or the covering letter, although it had appeared in the pilot letter. There were two reasons for this: first, it was felt that, however defined, censorship was a sensitive issue and that the word itself might trigger an emotional response or cause people to hesitate to answer questions about it. Second, asking people about their experience with censorship would require them to make a judgment in advance of answering questions, based upon their individual definitions of censorship. It seemed desirable to avoid this by asking for relatively objective data without using the word "censorship."

Even without use of the term, it was realized that many recipients of the questionnaire would recognize that the questions were concerned with censorship and might feel reluctant to respond, and that others--regardless of the subject under investigation--might hesitate to reply for fear that their answers would not be held in confidence. Nevertheless, it was decided that it was necessary to identify respondents in some fashion in order to make follow-up of non-respondents possible, and that this should not be concealed from the questionnaire recipients. To that purpose, "Code #" was printed at the end of the questionnaire and a number stamped in colored ink in each case. The statement "All replies will be treated confidentially" immediately preceded the code number.

Universe and Sample

The initial population from which the sample was to be drawn was the membership of the Secondary Section of the National Council of Teachers of English, a group composed primarily of secondary school English teachers. Accordingly, from the national headquarters of the Council, an IBM list was obtained which included all persons holding regular membership in the Secondary Section as of March 1964. After elimination of members residing outside the continental United States, the remaining list contained 23,435 names. The sample was drawn by selecting every twenty-fifth name on the list, beginning with the randomly selected number seven, and resulting in a total sample of 939 names.

Questionnaire Distribution and Response

On May 11, 1964, a copy of the questionnaire, covering letter (see Appendix B, pages 116-120) and return addressed envelope, were mailed to every person in the sample group. By the end of the fourth week after mailing, 584 responses had been received, a 62.1 per cent (N=939) response. However, the number of responses per week had diminished markedly from a high of 329 received during the second week after mailing to a low of 27 during the fourth week.

In the hope of increasing both the weekly rate of response and the final total response, on June 9, 1964, a follow-up letter (see Appendix C, page 121) was mailed to every non-respondent (N=355), again with a copy of the questionnaire and return envelope enclosed. The response did increase, to a high of 91 during the second week after the follow-up mailing, then dropped again to 32 received during the fourth week after follow-up.

The arbitrarily pre-determined cut-off date for receipt of responses was July 7, eight weeks after the first mailing. By that time, a total of 767 questionnaires had been returned for an 81.6 per cent response (N=939). Additional questionnaires were received after the cut-off date and, although they were not included in tabulations of responses, they were counted and brought the final actual total of returns to 783, or 83.4 per cent (N=939).

Population Responding

Of the total body of responses received by the cut-off date, only nine, or 1.17 per cent (N=767), were not usable. These were ones which had been returned entirely blank or with more than half of the items unanswered.

A second group of responses was eliminated--by design--after the first tabulation. The study was concerned only with secondary school teachers of English currently employed in public schools. However, the membership of the Secondary Section of the National Council of Teachers of English was known to include people who were employed in private or parochial secondary schools, in colleges, or in other positions not relevant to the study. Since the Council headquarters was unable to identify these people or to remove their names from the list provided, it was probable that some of them would fall within the sample. The problem then was to identify them through the questionnaire; to obtain from them a reply indicating their status without asking them to respond to the body of questionnaire items.

To encourage returns from that group, this statement was included in the covering letter: "If you are not at present a teacher of English in a public secondary school, will you kindly check the appropriate answer to the first question and return the questionnaire. Your response will be important in the final tabulation of returns." The first questionnaire item asked "Which of the following statements applies to you?" and provided, as the second of two possible answers, "I am not currently employed as a teacher of English in a public secondary school; therefore I am returning the questionnaire to you unanswered." A total of 142 respondents, or 18.51 per cent of the responding group (N=767), checked this response.

The remainder of the respondents, 616 or 80.05 per cent (N=767), checked the answer "I am currently employed as a teacher of English in a public secondary school." Their responses serve as the basis for the remainder of this report.

Summary of Responses

Questionnaires in original mailing	939	
Responses received before 8-week cut-off	767	81.6%
Not usable (blank, incomplete)	9	
Not currently teaching English in public secondary school	142	
Currently teaching English in public secondary school	616	
Responses received after cut-off date	16	
Total number of responses	783	83.4%

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS: CENSORSHIP--THE CONTEXT

The questionnaire items were ordered so that respondents were expected to answer all questions from the second through the twenty-third. The twenty-third question asked: "During the past two years, has anyone specifically objected to, or asked for the removal of, any book(s) which you personally have used or proposed using in the English courses you teach?" Anyone who replied negatively to that query was directed to skip to the thirty-fourth item which merely thanked him and directed him to return the questionnaire in the envelope provided. Those who answered the twenty-third question positively were then asked to name the books to which some objection had been made and to provide additional information about each incident of objection.

Of the 616 respondents currently employed as teachers of English in the public secondary schools, 78 (12.6 per cent) replied positively on that item. Examination of their responses showed that at least one incident reported by each of these respondents would fall within the definition of censorship used in this study. (This will be discussed in greater detail at a later point in the report.)

In tabulating the remainder of the questions to which answers were expected from all respondents, it seemed desirable to discover whether the responses from teachers who reported no censorship experience during the period under study differed from those of teachers who had some such experience to report. Therefore, all responses to questions two through seventeen, and nineteen through twenty-two, were cross-tabulated with the responses to question twenty-three.

The Teachers

Highest degree or equivalent. As shown in Table I, slightly more than half (51.8 per cent) of all the teachers responding had completed advanced degrees--master's, doctorates--or equivalent credits. However, the teachers reporting censorship experience had a higher percentage of advanced degrees than did those reporting no censorship. Either the master's or doctoral degree (or equivalent credits) was held by 55.1 per cent of those with censorship experience, compared to 51.3 per cent of the "no censorship" group. The percentage was higher for the group with censorship experience on both the master's and the doctoral levels.

Recency of training. The teachers reporting censorship experience tended to have earned their highest degrees or equivalent credits more recently than those not reporting censorship incidents. (See Table II.) Within the former group, 61.5 per cent had completed these degrees since 1954, compared to 53.7 per cent of the latter group.

Examination of this same table reveals other interesting points. While the difference between the two groups in regard to recency of training appears in the reports for 1954 through 1963, there is almost no difference between them in the 1964 percentages. There was approximately the same percentage of teachers with degrees earned in 1964 within the group with censorship experience as in the group with none. At the other end of the table, however, their highest degree had been earned prior to 1944 by a larger percentage (23.2) of those who reported no

TABLE I

HIGHEST DEGREE OR EQUIVALENT CREDITS REPORTED

Degree or Credits	Teachers Reporting Censorship n=78		Teachers Reporting No Censorship n=538		Total n=616	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Normal school	0	0	1	.2	1	.2
Bachelor's	35	44.9	260	48.3	295	47.9
Master's	40	51.3	265	49.3	305	49.5
Doctorate	3	3.8	11	2.0	14	2.3
NA, not usable	0	0	1	.2	1	.2

TABLE II

DATE OF COMPLETION OF HIGHEST DEGREE

Date	Teachers Reporting Censorship n=78		Teachers Reporting No Censorship n=538		Total n=616	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1964	3	3.8	17	3.2	20	3.2
1959 - 1963	31	39.8	195	36.2	226	36.7
1954 - 1958	14	17.9	77	14.3	91	14.8
1949 - 1953	6	7.7	52	9.7	58	9.4
1944 - 1948	5	6.4	25	4.6	30	4.9
pre - 1944	10	12.8	125	23.2	135	21.9
NA, not usable	9	11.5	47	8.7	56	9.1

censorship experience than of those reporting incidents (12.8).

This question had a high rate of non-response (9.1 per cent), the reasons for which are not clear. It may have been due to the reluctance of many people to give answers which can reveal age; however, two questions on length of service each had less than one per cent non-response. The question itself may have been confusing. While no attempt was made to tally separately the number of questionnaires which had no response to this question and those which had non-usable responses, there appeared to be a number of non-usable ones. These included answers such as "senior," "4," and "8."

Type of training institution. The questionnaire recipients were asked to name the institution from which they received their highest degree; their responses were then categorized as shown in Table III. More than half of all the teachers responding were graduates of universities (52.6 per cent of the teachers reporting censorship; 54.3 per cent of those reporting no censorship). But, the teachers with censorship experience included a larger proportion of liberal arts college graduates (21.8 per cent) than was found in the group with no censorship experience (15.1 per cent) and a smaller proportion of state and teachers college graduates (20.5 per cent) than in the "no censorship" group (27.1 per cent).

Major subject studied. Another immediately visible difference between the two groups of teachers was found in the responses to the question of "major," which were categorized merely as "English" and "other," as seen in Table IV. A higher percentage of majors in English was found within the group which had had censorship experience (71.8 per cent) than in the group with no such experience (64.9 per cent).

TABLE III

TYPE OF INSTITUTION GRANTING HIGHEST DEGREE

Type of Institution	Teachers Reporting Censorship n=78		Teachers Reporting No Censorship n=538		Total n=616	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
University	41	52.6	292	54.3	333	54.1
Liberal arts college	17	21.8	81	15.1	98	15.9
State college	12	15.4	97	18.0	109	17.7
Teachers college	4	5.1	49	9.1	53	8.6
Other	0	0.0	10	1.8	10	1.6
NA, not usable	4	5.1	9	1.7	13	2.1

TABLE IV

MAJOR SUBJECT STUDIED FOR HIGHEST DEGREE

Major Subject	Teachers Reporting Censorship n=78		Teachers Reporting No Censorship n=538		Total n=616	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
English	56	71.8	349	64.9	405	65.8
Other	19	24.4	179	33.3	198	32.1
NA, not usable	3	3.8	10	1.9	13	2.1

Experience in teaching English. The teachers with censorship incidents to report ranged from beginning teachers with less than a year of experience to veterans of more than twenty years in the field. As a whole, they had had somewhat less experience teaching English than those reporting no censorship. The greatest difference between the groups (see Table V) appears in the categories of from two to ten years of experience: 61.6 per cent of the "censorship" group fell within this range, compared to 51.7 of the "no censorship" group.

Special attention should be paid to the two ends of the table as well. While 11.2 per cent of the group as a whole, and 11.5 per cent of the "no censorship" group had taught English for one year or less, a smaller percentage (9.0) of the "censorship" group fell within this category. A heavier percentage of less experienced teachers may have had censorship experience to report, but this was not true of the real "beginning" teachers, the ones with less than a year of teaching in the field behind them.

On the other end, it was not only the relatively less experienced teachers who had censorship incidents to report: 16.7 per cent of the "censorship" group had taught for more than twenty years. This actually was slightly higher than the percentage (15.8) in that experience category of those with no censorship experience.

Length of service in present position. Again, the "censored" group included a range from teachers with less than one year of service in their current positions to those who had held the same position for more than twenty years. (See Table VI.) Some of the same general patterns seemed to hold as in the previous question. More than

TABLE V

YEARS OF EXPERIENCE TEACHING ENGLISH

Number of Years	Teachers Reporting Censorship n=78		Teachers Reporting No Censorship n=538		Total n=616	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1 year or less	7	9.0	62	11.5	69	11.2
2 - 5 years	29	37.2	157	29.2	186	30.2
6 - 10 years	19	24.4	121	22.5	140	22.7
11 - 15 years	6	7.7	68	12.6	74	12.0
16 - 20 years	4	5.1	42	7.8	46	7.5
More than 20 years	13	16.7	85	15.8	98	15.9
NA, not usable	0	0	3	.6	3	.5

TABLE VI

LENGTH OF SERVICE IN PRESENT POSITION

Number of Years	Teachers Reporting Censorship n=78		Teachers Reporting No Censorship n=538		Total n=616	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1 year or less	13	16.7	103	19.1	116	18.8
2 - 5 years	31	39.7	223	41.4	254	41.2
6 - 10 years	20	25.6	98	18.2	118	19.2
11 - 15 years	5	6.4	34	6.3	39	6.3
16 - 20 years	1	1.3	35	6.5	36	5.8
More than 20 years	7	9.0	42	7.8	49	8.0
NA, not usable	1	1.3	3	.6	4	.6

two-thirds (65.3 per cent) of the group with censorship experience had held their positions from two to ten years compared to 59.6 per cent of the "no censorship" group. A higher percentage of the "no censorship" group fell within the "one year or less" category (19.1 per cent, compared to 16.7 per cent of the "censorship" group). A higher percentage of the "censorship" group than of the "no censorship" group (9.0 per cent compared to 7.8 per cent) reported more than twenty years of service in the same position.

Grade level of present English teaching assignment. While the major portion (80.7 per cent) of the total group of respondents was teaching on the senior high school level, there were differences between the sub-groups. (See Table VII.) A greater percentage of the teachers reporting censorship experience (88.5 per cent) taught in grades nine through twelve than did those with no censorship experience to report (79.6).

Teacher's self-description. The first purely subjective question asked respondents to describe themselves "in regard to political and social issues" by selecting one of three adjectives provided: "conservative," "middle-of-the-road," or "liberal." Table VIII shows that, of the "censorship" group, 42.3 per cent saw themselves as "liberal," 37.2 per cent as "middle-of-the-road," and 19.2 per cent as "conservative." Major differences appear in comparing these responses with those of the "no censorship" group. A much smaller percentage (25.6) of the latter group selected "liberal" as self-descriptive; a much larger percentage (54.8) selected "middle-of-the-road." A slightly smaller percentage (18.0) selected "conservative," thus making the "no censorship" group as a whole more of a "middle" group, with

TABLE VII

GRADE LEVEL TEACHING ASSIGNMENT IN ENGLISH

Grade	Teachers Reporting Censorship n=78		Teachers Reporting No Censorship n=538		Total n=616	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
7th/8th grade(s)	7	9.0	96	17.8	103	16.7
9th/10th grade(s)	34	43.6	227	42.2	261	42.4
11th/12th grade(s)	35	44.9	201	37.4	236	38.3
All grades	0	0	10	1.9	10	1.6
NA, not usable	2	2.6	4	.7	6	1.0

TABLE VIII

SELF-DESCRIPTION IN TERMS OF POLITICAL AND SOCIAL ISSUES

Self-Description	Teachers Reporting Censorship n=78		Teachers Reporting No Censorship n=538		Total n=616	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Conservative	15	19.2	97	18.0	112	18.2
Middle-of-the-Road	29	37.2	295	54.8	324	52.6
Liberal	33	42.3	138	25.6	171	27.8
NA, not usable	1	1.3	8	1.5	9	1.5

its members seeing themselves as less sharply defined than did the members of the "censorship" group.

Comparison of self-description with community description. Somewhat later in the questionnaire, respondents were asked to choose one from this same set of adjectives to describe the community in which they were teaching. The responses to these two questions in each case were examined to see whether the same or a different adjective was selected by the teacher to describe himself and to describe the community. (See Table IX.) Ten per cent more of the group reporting censorship experience (64.1 per cent) than of the "no censorship" group (54.1 per cent) saw themselves as different from the community.

The Community

Type of community. (See Table X.) The largest percentage of teachers in the "censorship" group were employed in suburban areas (43.5 per cent), while the largest percentage of the "no censorship" teachers worked in urban communities (39.4 per cent). Of the "censorship" group, 16.7 per cent described the community as "rural"; 22.4 per cent of the "no censorship" group did so.

Size of community. In general, the teachers reporting censorship experience came from larger communities than did those with no censorship experience. (See Table XI.) Comparing the two groups, a higher percentage of the "censorship" group came from communities over 50,000 in population (40.2 per cent, compared to 27.8 per cent). A higher percentage of the "no censorship" group came from communities under 50,000 (56.6 per cent compared to 44.9 per cent). The percentage of blank and non-usable answers was high (15.5 per cent total) on this

TABLE IX

COMPARISON OF SELF-DESCRIPTION AND COMMUNITY DESCRIPTION IN REGARD TO POLITICAL AND SOCIAL ISSUES

Comparison	Teachers Reporting Censorship n=78		Teachers Reporting No Censorship n=538		Total n=616	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Different	50	64.1	291	54.1	341	55.4
Identical	27	34.6	242	45.0	269	43.7
NA, not usable	1	1.3	5	.9	6	1.0

TABLE X

TYPE OF COMMUNITY IN WHICH SCHOOL IS LOCATED

Type of Community	Teachers Reporting Censorship n=78		Teachers Reporting No Censorship n=538		Total n=616	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Urban	27	34.6	212	39.4	239	38.9
Suburban	34	43.5	185	34.4	219	35.5
Rural	13	16.7	120	22.4	133	21.6
NA, not usable	1	1.3	12	2.2	13	2.1
More than one answer	3	4.0	9	1.7	12	2.0

TABLE XI

SIZE OF COMMUNITY IN WHICH SCHOOL IS LOCATED

Size of Community	Teachers Reporting Censorship n=78		Teachers Reporting No Censorship n=538		Total n=616	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Under 2,500	6	7.7	56	10.4	62	10.0
2,500 - 9,999	7	9.0	96	17.8	103	16.7
10,000 - 49,999	22	28.2	153	28.4	175	28.4
50,000 - 249,999	24	30.8	93	17.3	117	19.0
250,000 - 999,999	5	6.4	40	7.5	45	7.3
1,000,000 or more	3	3.8	16	3.0	19	3.1
NA, not usable	11	14.2	84	15.6	95	15.5

question. The response rate might have been higher had answer categories been provided.

Description of community. When asked to describe the community, the largest percentage (46.2) of teachers in the "censorship" group selected the term "middle-of-the-road," although this was a smaller percentage than of those in the "no censorship" group (51.9) who chose this description. (See Table XII.) Not only did the teachers with censorship experience see themselves as more sharply defined than did those in the "no censorship" group (see pages 38 and 39), but they also saw their communities in this way. Within the "censorship" group, 42.3 per cent named their communities "conservative," compared to 37.2 per cent in the "no censorship" group; 10.2 called them "liberal," compared to 7.6 per cent in the "no censorship" group.

Amount of public criticism of local schools. More than half of all the respondents (54.2 per cent) indicated that there had been "much" or "some" public criticism of the schools in the community. (See Table XIII.) However, while the "no censorship" group reported that in 52.8 per cent of their communities there had been "much" or "some" criticism, teachers with censorship experience reported a total of 64.1 per cent (15.4 per cent "much"; 48.7 per cent "some"). The percentage reporting "none" was considerably lower in the "censorship" group (11.5 per cent) than in the "no censorship" group (23.4 per cent).

Subject of public criticism of local schools. (See Table XIV.) More than one answer was permissible in response to the question the subject of public criticisms of the schools. "School costs" led the list, having been reported in 36.6 per cent of the 805 replies.

TABLE XII

DESCRIPTION OF COMMUNITY IN REGARD TO SOCIAL AND POLITICAL ISSUES

Description	Teachers Reporting Censorship n=78		Teachers Reporting No Censorship n=538		Total n=616	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Conservative	33	42.3	200	37.2	233	37.8
Middle-of-the-Road	36	46.2	279	51.9	315	51.1
Liberal	8	10.2	41	7.6	49	8.0
NA, not usable	1	1.3	18	3.3	19	3.1

TABLE XIII

AMOUNT OF PUBLIC CRITICISM OF LOCAL SCHOOLS

Amount of Criticism	Teachers Reporting Censorship n=78		Teachers Reporting No Censorship n=538		Total n=616	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Much	12	15.4	78	14.5	90	14.6
Some	38	48.7	206	38.3	244	39.6
Little	18	23.1	113	21.0	131	21.3
None	9	11.5	126	23.4	135	21.9
NA, not usable	1	1.3	15	2.8	16	2.6

TABLE XIV

SUBJECT OF PUBLIC CRITICISM OF LOCAL SCHOOLS

Subject of Criticism*	Teachers Reporting Censorship n=126		Teachers Reporting No Censorship n=679		Total n=805	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
School costs	44	34.9	251	37.0	295	36.6
Curriculum	16	12.7	107	15.8	123	15.3
Textbooks	22	17.5	62	9.1	84	10.4
Teachers	17	13.5	109	16.0	126	15.6
Other	26	20.6	132	19.4	158	19.6
Don't know	1	.8	18	2.6	19	2.4

*More than one answer possible.

It was mentioned most frequently by both the teachers reporting censorship experience (34.9 per cent, N=126) and those in the "no censorship" group (37.0 per cent, N=679). Both of the sub-groups ranked "other" subjects second; an examination of the "other" responses suggests that many or most of them could be classified as "policies" or "administration."

In the reports of the "censorship" group, "textbooks" were third in frequency of mention (17.5 per cent), followed by "teachers" and "curriculum." In the "no censorship" group responses, "textbooks" ranked last in frequency, preceded by "teachers" and "curriculum."

Curricular area of textbooks criticized by public. If they had reported "textbooks" as one subject of public criticism, the respondents were then asked to note the curricular area(s) in which this had occurred. (Again, more than one answer was possible, as noted in Table XV.) In communities where teachers reporting censorship were employed, English textbooks were most frequently criticized (46.2 per cent, N=39), followed by Social Studies, Mathematics, and Science, in that order. This was not the case, however, in the communities where the "no censorship" group worked. In their reports, Social Studies texts ranked first (41.1, N=129) as targets for criticism, followed--in order--by English, Mathematics, and Science.

Criticisms of textbooks by public. Because of the way in which this question was phrased ("What criticism was made of the books?"), it was not possible to determine which particular criticisms applied to which textbooks. Here, too, more than one answer was possible. (See Table XVI.) "Obscene, vulgar" was the specific criticism checked most frequently by the teachers in the "censorship" group (30 per cent,

TABLE XV

CURRICULAR AREA OF TEXTBOOKS CRITICIZED BY PUBLIC

Curricular Area*	Teachers Reporting Censorship n=39		Teachers Reporting No Censorship n=129		Total n=168	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Social Studies	9	23.1	53	41.1	62	36.9
English	18	46.2	38	29.5	56	33.3
Mathematics	3	7.7	17	13.2	20	11.9
Science	7	17.9	13	10.1	20	11.9
Other	1	2.6	5	3.9	6	3.6
Don't know	1	2.6	3	2.3	4	2.4

*More than one answer possible.

TABLE XVI

CRITICISMS OF TEXTBOOKS BY PUBLIC

Criticism*	Teachers Reporting Censorship n=50		Teachers Reporting No Censorship n=119		Total n=169	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Out of date	8	16.0	12	10.1	20	11.8
Inaccurate	3	6.0	11	9.2	14	8.3
Poorly written	2	4.0	9	7.6	11	6.5
Communistic, Socialistic	7	14.0	14	11.7	21	12.4
Un-American	6	12.0	19	16.0	25	14.8
Inadequate coverage	4	8.0	21	17.6	25	14.8
Obscene, vulgar	15	30.0	15	12.6	30	17.8
Other	5	10.0	14	11.8	19	11.2
Don't know	0	0	4	3.4	4	2.4

*More than one answer possible.

n=50), followed by "out of date" with 16 percent, "communistic, socialistic" with 14 per cent, and "un-American," 12 per cent.

No one criticism was mentioned as often by the "no censorship" group as was "obscenity" by the "censorship" group. "Inadequate coverage" led in reports by the "no censorship" group, with 17.6 per cent (n=119), followed by "un-American" (16 per cent), then by "obscene, vulgar" (12.6 per cent), "other" (11.8 per cent) and "communistic, socialistic" (11.7 per cent).

The School

School enrollment. Compared to the teachers without censorship experience to report, teachers in the "censorship" group more often worked in moderately large (1500-3499 pupils) schools, less often in very small (less than 500 pupils) schools. Summarizing from Table XVII, 44.8 per cent of the "censorship" group teachers were employed in schools with 1500 to 3499 pupils, compared to 29.9 per cent of the "no censorship" group; 6.4 per cent of the "censorship" group worked in schools with less than 500 pupils, compared to 17.7 of the "no censorship" group. There was only a slight (approximately 1 per cent) difference between the two groups in the percentages of those who held positions in schools of 500 to 1499 pupils, and in schools of 3500 or more.

School curricula. Responses to the question "Which of the following curricula are provided in the school in which you teach?" were categorized in two different ways, as shown in Table XVIII. Compared to the "no censorship" group, a higher percentage of teachers reporting censorship experience work in schools with multiple curricula

TABLE XVII

SIZE OF SCHOOL ENROLLMENT

Size of School	Teachers Reporting Censorship n=78		Teachers Reporting No Censorship n=538		Total n=616	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Less than 500	5	6.4	95	17.7	100	16.2
500 - 1499	37	47.4	263	48.9	300	48.7
1500 - 2499	26	33.3	121	22.5	147	23.9
2500 - 3499	9	11.5	40	7.4	49	8.0
3500 or more	1	1.3	12	2.2	13	2.1
NA, not usable	0	0	7	1.3	7	1.1

TABLE XVIII

CURRICULA PROVIDED IN SCHOOL

Curricula	Teachers Reporting Censorship n=78		Teachers Reporting No Censorship n=538		Total n=616	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Multiple curricula	69	88.5	437	81.2	506	82.1
Single curriculum	7	9.0	89	16.5	96	15.6
NA, not usable	2	2.5	12	2.2	14	2.3
C.P.[*] included	71	91.0	455	84.6	526	85.4
C.P. not included	5	6.4	71	13.2	76	12.3
NA, not usable	2	2.5	12	2.2	14	2.3

[*] College preparatory curriculum.

(88.5 per cent, compared to 81.2) and a correspondingly smaller percentage in schools with single curricula. Again, compared to the "no censorship group," teachers in the "censorship" group more often came from schools which included a college preparatory curriculum (91.0 per cent, compared to 84.6).

School policy in regard to public complaints about schoolbooks. There was a high rate of non-response (10.1 per cent total) on this item which asked "Does your school have an established policy or set of procedures for handling complaints from the public about books used in the school?" This may well have been the result of its placement or position in the questionnaire. This item was numbered seventeen. Question thirteen asked about criticism of the schools and then said, "If none, skip to question 17." Question seventeen appeared on the next page, followed by eighteen and then by a blank space of an inch or more. One conjecture is that people seeing the space assumed that they were to skip to the question immediately below. (There was only a normal rate of non-response on that item.) Another possibility, of course, is that people were reluctant to answer the question--either because they did not know the answer (but preferred not to admit that) or because they preferred not to report on it.

A third of all the respondents (36.8 per cent) said they didn't know if their school had such a policy or set of procedures. (See Table XIX.) However, a greater percentage of the people with censorship experience knew (only 19.2 per cent checked "don't know") than did those in the "no censorship" group (39.4 per cent of whom didn't know). Almost half (47.4 per cent) of the "censorship" group reported that their school had a policy; only 17.7 of the "no censorship" group said that their schools did.

TABLE XIX

EXISTENCE OF SCHOOL POLICY OR PROCEDURES FOR DEALING WITH PUBLIC COMPLAINTS ABOUT TEXTBOOKS

Existence of Policy	Teachers Reporting Censorship n=78		Teachers Reporting No Censorship n=538		Total n=616	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	37	47.4	95	17.7	132	21.4
No	19	24.4	176	32.7	195	31.7
Don't know	15	19.2	212	39.4	227	36.8
NA, not usable	7	9.0	55	10.2	62	10.1

Those respondents who indicated that their school had an established policy were asked to describe that policy or set of procedures for handling complaints from the public about books used in the school. This was the first of only two open questions included in the entire questionnaire. Since no set of possible answers was provided, and no pattern of answering demonstrated, the responses varied widely in approach as well as in length. Some concentrated on the people involved in dealing with the complaints, e.g. principal, teacher, committee; some on the method: conference, written form, open hearing; a few provided detailed descriptions of both personnel and method.

Of all of the responses to this question, in thirty-three instances (25 per cent), complaints about books were to be directed to either a superintendent or a principal; fourteen of these administrators apparently were given responsibility for handling the situation alone. Nineteen other administrators were to channel the complaint either to the Board of Education (5 cases) or to school personnel--department heads, teachers, librarians (14).

The second most frequently reported system involved the referral of all such complaints to a committee established for that purpose (28, or 21.2 per cent). Eleven of these reports included the composition of the committee, but no one pattern predominated. There were committees of people drawn from only one segment of the school system, such as school board members or teachers, and more broadly representative committees comprised of various subject teachers, department heads, local and district administrators, and librarians. Four committees included parents or other laymen as well as school staff members.

The third most frequent response (22, or 16.7 per cent) was that the school followed "the NCTE policy," "the system recommended in The Students' Right to Read," "the English Council policy," or something similar. These were references to a plan for dealing with book complaints which was presented in The Students' Right to Read, the pamphlet published by The National Council of Teachers of English which recommended the creation and use of a standard form which citizens would be required to complete when making such a complaint, and the establishment of a teachers' committee to review those received. Although they did not specifically cite the Council form, three additional responses stated that it was their policy to require a detailed form to be filed.

Materials used by teachers. A high percentage of both the "censorship" and the "no censorship" groups used textbooks in the English courses they taught. Literature textbooks were used by 85.8 per cent of the former group; by 90.9 per cent of the latter. However, there were marked differences between these two groups in their use of other literary materials in the teaching of English. Compared to 80.8 per cent of the "censorship" group, only 64.3 per cent of the "no censorship" group used required readings in literature other than the textbook. While 79.5 per cent of the "censorship" group used recommended readings in literature and 76.9 per cent used literature selected by the student (free reading), 66.9 per cent of the "no censorship" group used recommended readings and 61.5 per cent, free reading.

Selection of textbooks. As seen in Table XXI, textbooks were selected by department committees or faculty in more than two-thirds (70.5 per cent) of the situations where censorship incidents were reported. This was a higher percentage than that reported by the "no

TABLE XX

MATERIALS USED BY TEACHERS IN ENGLISH COURSES

Material	Teachers Reporting Censorship n=78		Teachers Reporting No Censorship n=538		Total n=616	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Literature textbook	67	85.8	489	90.9	556	90.3
Grammar and/or language arts textbook	68	87.2	474	88.2	542	88.1
Required readings in lit. other than textbook	63	80.8	346	64.3	409	66.4
Recommended readings in literature	62	79.5	360	66.9	422	68.5
Free reading (literature selected by student)	60	76.9	331	61.5	391	63.6

TABLE XXI

METHOD OF SELECTING TEXTBOOKS

Selection Method	Teachers Reporting Censorship n=78		Teachers Reporting No Censorship n=538		Total n=616	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Teacher-free choice	5	6.4	62	11.5	67	10.9
Teacher-approved list	4	5.1	52	9.7	56	9.1
Dept. faculty or comm.	55	70.5	323	60.0	378	61.4
Other	13	16.7	90	16.7	103	16.7
NA, not usable	1	1.3	11	2.0	12	1.9

censorship" group (60.0 per cent) and by the group as a whole (61.4 per cent). Less than 10 per cent of the "censorship" group reported any other single method: 6.4 per cent indicated that the individual teacher had free choice; 5.1 per cent said that the individual teacher selected from an approved list.

Selection of required or recommended readings. A different pattern appeared in relation to the selection of required or recommended readings other than textbooks as reported by the teachers with censorship experience. (See Table XXII.) Only one-fourth (23.1 per cent) of these books were selected by department committees or faculties; in half (51.2 per cent) of the situations, the individual teacher had free choice, and in 15.4 per cent, he chose from an approved list. Here again, however, selection by department committees or faculties was even less typical of the settings in which the "no censorship" group worked (15.2 per cent). Teachers had free choice in 53.7 per cent of the situations, chose from an approved list in 21 per cent.

Teachers' freedom to determine course content. The next question was designed to assess the teachers' perceptions of the amount of freedom they enjoyed in relation to three aspects of their professional activities: determination of course content; determination of teaching methods; and selection of instructional materials. In reply to the query "In your opinion, how much freedom do you have to . . . ?" teachers checked one of four answers on a continuum from "much" to "none."

More than half (57.7 per cent) of the group reporting censorship incidents felt that they had "much" freedom to determine course content, but this was less than the percentage of the "no censorship" group (66.4 per cent) which felt that way. (See Table XXIII.) On the other

TABLE XXII

METHOD OF SELECTING REQUIRED AND/OR RECOMMENDED READINGS USED IN ADDITION TO TEXTBOOK

Selection Method	Teachers Reporting Censorship n=78		Teachers Reporting No Censorship n=538		Total n=616	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Teacher-free choice	40	51.2	289	53.7	329	53.4
Teacher-approved list	12	15.4	113	21.0	125	20.3
Dept. faculty or comm.	18	23.1	82	15.2	100	16.2
Other	8	10.2	30	5.6	38	6.2
NA, not usable	0	0	24	4.5	24	3.9

TABLE XXIII

DEGREE OF FREEDOM TO DETERMINE COURSE CONTENT REPORTED BY TEACHERS

Degree of Freedom	Teachers Reporting Censorship n=78		Teachers Reporting No Censorship n=538		Total n=616	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Much	45	57.7	357	66.4	402	65.2
Some	23	29.5	136	25.3	159	25.8
Little	8	10.2	28	5.2	36	5.8
None	2	2.6	11	2.0	13	2.1
NA, not usable	0	0	6	1.1	6	1.0

end of the scale, a larger percentage (10.2) of the "censorship" than of the "no censorship" group (5.2) said they had "little" freedom in this area; approximately 2 per cent of both groups said they had "none."

Teachers' freedom to determine teaching methods. While there was less of a difference between the sub-groups on the question of freedom to determine teaching methods, the teachers with censorship experience continued to report a somewhat lower percentage of "much" freedom (88.5 per cent) than those with no censorship experience (91.4). (See Table XXIV.) There was less than a 1 per cent difference between the groups on either the "little" or the "none" category.

Teachers' freedom to select instructional materials. As seen in Table XXV, the gap between the groups became wider again in the first answer category. "Much" freedom was reported by 52.6 per cent of the "censorship" group compared to 59.9 per cent of those with no censorship to report. Again, there was less than a 1 per cent difference between them on either the "little" or the "none" category.

TABLE XXIV

DEGREE OF FREEDOM TO DETERMINE TEACHING METHODS REPORTED BY TEACHERS

Degree of Freedom	Teachers Reporting Censorship n=78		Teachers Reporting No Censorship n=538		Total n=616	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Much	69	88.5	492	91.4	561	91.1
Some	6	7.7	27	5.0	33	5.4
Little	1	1.3	6	1.1	7	1.1
None	1	1.3	2	.4	3	.5
NA, not usable	1	1.3	11	2.0	12	1.9

TABLE XXV

DEGREE OF FREEDOM TO SELECT INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS REPORTED BY TEACHERS

Degree of Freedom	Teachers Reporting Censorship n=78		Teachers Reporting No Censorship n=538		Total n=616	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Much	41	52.6	322	59.9	363	58.9
Some	27	34.6	152	28.3	179	29.1
Little	7	9.0	40	7.4	47	7.6
None	2	2.6	11	2.0	13	2.1
NA, not usable	1	1.3	13	2.4	14	2.3

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS: CENSORSHIP--INCIDENCE AND INCIDENTS

Incidence

"During the past two years, has anyone specifically objected to, or asked for the removal of, any book(s) which you personally have used or proposed using in the English courses you teach?" Seventy-eight of the 616 respondents who were currently employed as public school teachers of English answered "yes" to this question. Examination of their replies resulted in the inclusion of at least one incident reported by each of them within the definition of censorship employed in this study. Based on these figures, the incidence of censorship reported by the teachers covered in the study was 12.6 per cent. Thirteen of the questionnaires received after the cut-off date were from currently employed public school teachers of English, none of whom answered "yes" to the question. The incidence for the total number (629) of pertinent responses, therefore, was 12.4 per cent.

Every state was represented in the total response from people currently teaching; from each of 29 states (59.2 per cent) there was at least one positive response. (See Table XXXVII, pages 122-124.) The largest single number of positive reports came from California (9), which also had the largest number of respondents (56), for a 16.1 per cent incidence of censorship. New York was second in number of positive reports (8) and relevant responses (51); the incidence in New York was 15.7 per cent.

In individual state figures of incidence of censorship, Mississippi and Nevada led the list with 50 per cent each. However, in Mississippi this was based on two positive responses of a total of four; in Nevada, on one of two. Wisconsin ranked third on the list of individual states with four reports of censorship out of a total of eleven responses.

Tabulation of positive responses on a regional basis (See Table XXVI) showed the Far West to have the highest incidence (17.3 per cent), followed by the Middle Atlantic (16.1 per cent) and the Midwest (13.7 per cent). The lowest incidence was reported from the Southwest region (4.1 per cent).

Incidents

Of the 78 positive responses, 71 were usable and are discussed in the remainder of this chapter. One respondent had taught in his present position less than a year, and his positive response was related to the situation in which he had worked during the previous year. Following directions given in the questionnaire, he therefore did not provide details of the incident(s). Six others either left more than half of the questions in this section (questions 24 through 33) blank, or provided answers that were impossible to interpret or categorize.

The censored books. Those who had had censorship experience were asked to list "each book to which some objection was made" during the two year period in question. If more than three books were involved, the respondent was directed to list the three most recent cases. Of the 71 respondents whose replies to this section were usable, 38 listed one title each; 19 listed two titles; and 12 listed three. (Two ignored instructions and listed four each.) More than one book was listed by

TABLE XXVI

INCIDENCE OF CENSORSHIP, BY REGIONS

Region*	Number Teaching**	Teachers Reporting Censorship Incidents	
		Number	Per Cent
New England	49	4	8.2
Middle Atlantic	118	19	16.1
Southeast	94	10	10.6
Midwest	182	25	13.7
Southwest	49	2	4.1
Northwest	42	4	9.5
Far West	81	14	17.3

*New England: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont; Middle Atlantic: Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, West Virginia; Southeast: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia; Midwest: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, Wisconsin; Southwest: Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, Oklahoma; Northwest: Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming; Far West: California, Nevada, Oregon, Washington.

**N=615; one teacher's response could not be identified by state.

43.7 per cent of the teachers.

The 71 responses included a total of 120 books to which some objection had been made. (See Table XXXVIII, "Censored Books: Number of Objections, Objectors, Reasons for Objecting," pages 125-130.) These included: 3 textbooks; 57 different pieces of literature (novels, plays, short stories, biographies); and 3 more general responses ("all of Hemingway's works," "Harcourt Brace Literature Series," and "special unit containing four novels on related themes.") More than 50 different authors were represented in this list.

Censored books most frequently cited. The work most frequently objected to was Catcher in the Rye by J. D. Salinger; it was noted on responses from 25 teachers. (This book was named in the very first report of censorship received in both the pre-test and the actual survey.) No other book came close to Catcher in the Rye in frequency of mention. George Orwell's 1984 was second with a total of only 6; Diary of Anne Frank was third with 5. Five of Steinbeck's works were included, more than were included by any other author.

Date of publication, nationality of author of censored books. Fifty-five of the individual, non-textbook items were tabulated according to date of publication and nationality of author. (See Table XXXIX, pages 131-133.) (The Book of Job was eliminated, as was "Frankie and Johnny," the latter because it could not be identified other than as a ballad.) Summaries of the tabulations show that more than three-fourths of the works (76.3 per cent, N=55) had been published since 1920; more than half (52.7 per cent) since 1940.

Date of Publication	Number	Per Cent
pre-1920	13	23.6
1920 - 1939	13	23.6
1940 - 1959	23	41.8
1960 and later	6	10.9

Of the 46 authors represented within this list of 55 works, 31 were Americans, or 67.6 per cent.

Inclusion of censored books in recommended reading lists. Almost two-thirds (65.5 per cent) of the 55 works appeared on at least one of the three basic book lists or buying guides for high school English teachers and librarians: A Basic Book Collection for High Schools, published by the American Library Association; Standard Catalog for High School Libraries, published by The H. W. Wilson Company; and Books for You, from the National Council of Teachers of English. (See Appendix G, pages 134-136.) Of the total of 55, 19 appeared on the ALA list; 31 in the Wilson catalog; and 19 on the NCTE list. Twelve works were included in all three of these reference works.

Objectors. More than one answer was permitted in response to the question "Who raised the original objection?" and a total of 155 responses was received, half of which named parents as the objectors. There were 79 mentions of "parent," for a percentage of 50.9; the next most frequent response was "student," with a total of only 13, or 8.4 per cent. (See both Table XXVII for frequency of mention of each category of objector, and Table XXXVIII, pages 125-130, which lists objectors for each individual work.)

Recipient of report of objection. The person to whom these original objections were reported most frequently (39.4 per cent) was a

TABLE XXVII

CENSORSHIP INCIDENTS: THE OBJECTORS

Objector*	Frequency of Mention N=155
Parent	79
Student	13
Clergyman	11
Administrator	9
English department chairman	9
Another teacher	9
Local organization	9
3 Committee for Decent Literature 1 Baptist League 1 P.T.A. 1 Evangelical Ministerial Fellowship 3 Didn't specify	
National organization	4
2 State D.A.R. 1 Ku Klux Klan 1 Eastern States Evaluation Organization	
Member, Board of Education	2
Newspaper	2
No answer	1
Other	7
4 School librarian 1 English supervisor 1 Sister of student 1 Unknown	

*More than one answer possible.

principal or superintendent. (See Table XXVIII.) Out of 142 responses (more than one answer again being acceptable),these administrators were mentioned 46 times. The teachers (respondents) themselves were the direct recipients in 39 or 27.4 per cent of the instances.

Method of reporting objections. More than one method of reporting objections was used in many situations. Personal conferences were mentioned in 61 out of 135 responses; telephone calls in 39. (See Table XXIX.)

Reasons for objecting. At this point, the teachers were asked what reason had been given for objecting to each of the books reported. No set of possible answers was provided; responses were categorized after they were received. (See Table XXX; also Appendix H, page 137 for a list of the reasons as given, with the categories used.) The category of "language" (e.g. "profanity," "obscene language," "vulgar language") received most frequent mention (23.2 per cent, N=125). Second in frequency were the categories described as "specific incidents, characters, passages" and "vulgarity"; each was mentioned 24 times, or 19.2 per cent. (See Table XXXVIII, pages 125-130, which lists the specific objections to each work reported.)

Objections, by objectors. In a cross tabulation of objections by objectors (see Table XXXI), parents seemed much more concerned with "vulgarity" (mentioned 22 times), "language" (21), and "specific passages" (16) than with any other aspects of the works. "Language" led the lists of objections by students, other teachers, and administrators; "vulgarity" was the first in frequency for clergymen (tied with "specific passages"), department chairmen, and local organizations.

TABLE XXVIII

CENSORSHIP INCIDENTS: PERSON TO WHOM OBJECTIONS WERE REPORTED

Person*	Frequency of Mention N=142
Principal or superintendent	46
Directly to you	39
Board of Education	18
Department chairman	14
No answer	2
Other	23
8 Newspaper	
3 Another teacher	
3 Student(s)	
3 Parent(s)	
6 Miscellaneous	

*More than one answer possible.

TABLE XXIX

CENSORSHIP INCIDENTS: METHODS USED BY OBJECTORS TO REPORT OBJECTIONS

Method*	Frequency of Mention N=135
In personal conference	61
By telephone	39
By letter	19
No answer; don't know	7
Other	9
3 School grapevine 2 Newspaper articles 1 List mailed to school 1 Board meeting 2 Miscellaneous	

---

*More than one answer possible.

TABLE XXX

CENSORSHIP INCIDENTS: REASONS GIVEN FOR OBJECTING TO BOOKS

Reason*	Frequency of Mention N=125
Language	29
Specific incidents, characters, passages	24
Vulgarity	24
Suitability	10
Race, religion	9
Communism, leftism	9
Controversiality	3
Un-Americanism	3
No answer	2
Other	12
2 Sex	
2 Reading aloud	
8 Miscellaneous	

*More than one answer possible.

TABLE XXXI

OBJECTIONS, BY OBJECTORS[*]

Objections	Student	Parent	Clergyman	Another Teacher	Dept. Chairman	Administrator	Bd. of Ed. Mor.	Newspaperman	Local Org.	National Org.
Language	5	21	1	6	1	4	0	0	1	0
Specific Passages	2	16	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Vulgarity	2	22	3	0	3	0	1	1	5	1
Suitability	0	5	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	0
Race; Religion	0	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Communism; Leftism	1	7	2	0	1	0	0	1	3	1
Controversiality	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0
Un-Americanism	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Other	2	5	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0

---

[*] "Other" category of objectors has not been included.

Use of censored books. In just 15.8 per cent of the cases (N=120) were the books in question textbooks; for lack of any more specific information, one may only assume that the remaining books were trade books. Forty-two books (35 per cent) were being used as required reading. (See Table XXXII.) On the premise that students customarily are required to read their textbooks, the total then is 61 books or 50.9 per cent of those reported which students were required to read. One fifth (20 per cent) of the books were being used or to be used as free reading; another fifth (22.5 per cent) as recommended reading.

Grade levels where censored books were being used. The greatest number of the books reported for a particular class were in use or to be used in the eleventh grade, and the great majority of all the books were in use or to be used on the senior high school level. (See Table XXXIII.) Of the 120 books involved, only 8 (7 per cent) were for use in the seventh and eighth grades; 108 (90 per cent) were for grades nine through twelve.

Selection of censored books. Teachers had chosen the books in half (49.9 per cent, N=120) of the instances; 24.5 per cent selected from approved lists, 25.8 per cent made a free choice. (See Table XXXIV.) In 20 per cent of the cases, students had chosen from recommended lists; in 12.5 per cent, the students had made a free choice.

Form of censored books. More than two-thirds of the books (68.3 per cent, N=120) were being used in paperback form; one-fourth (24.2 per cent) in hardcover editions.

Outcomes of censorship incidents. The final query on the questionnaire was concerned with the outcome of the censorship situation. (See Table XXXV.) It asked respondents to describe "what happened after

TABLE XXXII

CENSORSHIP INCIDENTS: USE OF CENSORED BOOKS

Use	Frequency of Mention N=120
Textbook	19
Additional required reading	42
Recommended reading	27
Free reading	24
Combined use	6
Other (read aloud in class)	1
No answer	1

TABLE XXXIII

CENSORSHIP INCIDENTS: GRADE LEVELS ON WHICH CENSORED BOOKS WERE USED

Level	Frequency of Mention N=120
12th Grade	32
11th Grade	40
10th Grade	12
9th Grade	13
8th Grade	5
7th Grade	2
Combined 9-12 Grades	11
Combined 7-8 Grades	1
No answer; not relevant	4

TABLE XXXIV

CENSORSHIP INCIDENTS: SELECTION OF CENSORED BOOKS

Method	Frequency of Mention N=120
By student (free choice)	15
By student, from recommended list	24
By teacher (free choice)	31
By teacher from approved list	29
Other	17
No answer	4

TABLE XXXV

CENSORSHIP INCIDENTS: OUTCOMES

Outcome	Frequency of Mention N=120
Book retained for use as originally planned	70
Book retained, but method of use changed	18
Book removed from use	23
Outcome pending	8
Not clear	1

the initial objection was reported; what actions were taken by whom." Of the 120 specific works involved, 70 or 58.3 per cent were retained for use as originally designed; another 18 or 15 per cent were retained, but their status changed. (In 9 cases, the individual student was permitted to substitute another work; in 7, the book was moved from required to recommended, or recommended to free, reading lists; in 2, the book was removed from the list or catalog but kept available for mature readers.) There were 23 instances, 19.2 per cent, where the book was removed from use.

Comparison of incidents, by outcome. The cases where the outcome was removal of the books in question were compared, as a group, with the body of incidents where the books were retained and with the total body of censorship cases, to see what if any differences might be found in relation to each aspect of the incidents. No major differences were discovered, except in the question of the person to whom the objections were reported. (See Table XXXVI.)

Where books were removed, the complaints had been directed to: (1) administrators (principal, superintendent), 40.0 per cent, (2) Boards of Education, 25.7 per cent, (3) department chairmen, 14.3 per cent (N=35 in each instance). The teachers, themselves, ranked fourth, mentioned only 4 times, or 11.4 per cent.

In the reports of situations where books had been retained, the teachers directly involved were mentioned most frequently (32.7 per cent, N=107) as the recipients of complaints. They were followed by administrators (29.9 per cent) and others (18.7 per cent). Boards of Education and department chairmen tied for last place in frequency of mention with 9 each, for 8.4 per cent.

TABLE XXXVI

CENSORSHIP INCIDENTS: OUTCOMES, BY PERSONS TO WHOM OBJECTIONS REPORTED

Person to Whom Objection Reported*	Outcome of Censorship Incident					
	Removal of Book n=35		Retention of Book n=107		Total n=142	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Teacher	4	11.4	35	32.7	39	27.5
Board of Education	9	25.7	9	8.4	18	12.7
Administrator	14	40.0	32	29.9	46	32.4
Department chairman	5	14.3	9	8.4	14	9.9
Other	3	8.6	20	18.7	23	16.2
NA	0	0.0	2	1.9	2	1.4

*More than one answer possible.

Some Specific Cases

In the questionnaire, and in the pertinent tables and textual material in this report, an attempt was made to isolate specific aspects of censorship incidents which could be described in a relatively objective way. While this is useful, and probably is the best way in which to convey an image of the group of incidents as a whole, it does not and cannot give the reader any sense of the individual incidents. Also, the categorization of responses to the two open-end questions[1] necessarily meant elimination of most of the subjectively descriptive material provided by the respondents; it removed the color or flavor from the reports.

In this brief section, some of the missing color will be supplied. A few specific cases will be presented, using the teacher's own words for much of each report. There was no statistical basis for selection of the particular incidents; they merely seemed to the writer to be fairly representative of a number of incidents, or to have some especially interesting aspects.

Most of the situations reported were quite undramatic; they began and ended apparently with little or no attention paid to them by anyone but the people most directly involved. The following are typical "quiet" cases, with three different outcomes:

> In a Far Western school, a parent called the principal to object to the use of To Kill A Mockingbird, complaining about the author's "taking the Lord's name in vain." The book, in paperback form, had been selected by the teacher from an

---

[1] "What reason was given for objecting to the book?" and "Please describe what happened after the initial objection was reported. What actions were taken by whom? What was the final outcome?"

> approved list, and was being used as a textbook in a twelfth grade college preparatory section. "Conference with principal, parent, department chairman; parent briefed on total literature program and shown place of book in curriculum; attention directed to total book rather than segments or words; use of objectionable words placed in character context; parent satisfied with conference and appreciative of edification."

> In a Midwestern school, a parent called the principal to complain about the use of 1984, calling it "indecent literature." The teacher had selected this book, and had made it required reading--in paperback--for a twelfth grade class. "The principal consulted the approved reading catalogues used by school librarians and then informed the parent of the status given the book. We as teachers were told to recommend rather than require controversial books such as these."

> In a Southwestern school, the principal talked at lunch with the teacher about a library book which his son, in the 11th grade, had checked out for free reading. The principal objected to "the use of frank language--'gutter words'"--in Black Like Me. The book had been purchased in the "Books on Exhibit Collection." "The conversation was reported to the librarian. The administrator had become aware of the book when his son checked out the book to read. The administrator then read the book himself, and it was quietly withdrawn from the library."

In some, although relatively few, of the instances reported, the situation grew to proportions where it involved or became known to people not directly affected, to people outside the school. Below are reports of four such incidents, each of which was resolved (or at least ended) in a different way:

> In a suburban Midwestern community, parents complained to the principal about three books being used in paperback form as recommended reading for high school juniors and seniors. They considered Catcher in the Rye, Oxbow Incident, and Brave New World all to contain "obscene language." The principal "requested parents to state objections in writing, with specific references. Nobody replied to this request. The administration recommended to the objectors that book selections be left to the experts--meaning the teachers. Students wrote editorials in the school paper and in the local newspaper, expressing both disgust and amusement at 'immature parents.' After about a month, the furor died down and nobody has said a word since, even though students have continued reading the 'objectionable' books."

> In a Far Western School, a parent called the principal to object to the "obscene language" in Child of Our Time. This book had been selected by the teacher from an approved list, and was being used as a textbook in the ninth grade. "The principal conferred with but was unable to placate the parent. She then distributed typed excerpts to the members of the parents' club after which the parents voted to support the book and the free choice of the English Department."
>
> In a suburban community of a Southeastern state, a local organization--the Baptist League--was concerned about the "immorality and obscenity" of Catcher in the Rye and complained to the newspaper which then ran an editorial on the subject. The book was being used in paperback form as additional required reading in the 11th grade, having been chosen by the English Department. The complaint was reported to and discussed by the Board of Education. According to the teacher: "Seventy-five per cent of the students were reading this book without guidance, so the English department decided to use it as a text to avoid misinterpretation by the students. After the editorial appeared recommending the release of all teachers using the book (60 teachers) the Board of Education banned it from the classrooms and the library. The teachers protested, and were threatened with removal from their positions."
>
> In a rural Midwestern area, where most of the students in the school come from farms, there was much public criticism of the books used in English courses. The teacher reporting noted that ten books had been objected to, but listed only four: Catcher in the Rye, 1984, Brave New World, Ugly American. In each instance, it was parents who objected to the book but they "did not read entire book--only certain passages." The books were selected by the teacher from an approved list, and were being used in paperback form as additional required reading in twelfth grade college preparatory classes. "The action was primarily concerned with Catcher in the Rye. School board meetings were flooded with people. People started calling the school--national recognition was given to our little problems--including local T-V coverage. Whole issue was blown way out of proportion. Book was at one time taken off the list but was then put back on the list. Perhaps you read about the problem. We eventually lost principal and half of the high school faculty."

In the next instance, the particular books and objections were not typical of the majority of cases in this study. Although there is no evidence in the questionnaire to support this conclusion, the investigator believes that this incident involved either members of a national organization or parents familiar with textbook evaluations provided by that organization. This is not the primary reason for its inclusion, however. It provides a good argument for the adoption of schoolwide procedures for dealing with censorship attempts--before they are needed.

> In a Far Western state, parents voiced their objections to books which were being considered for adoption by the Board of Education. They complained that Loban's Adventures in Reading contained selections "slanted to the leftist point of view" and that American Speech by Hedde included "too many sample speeches by 'pinko's'." Both books had been recommended by a selection committee for use as textbooks, the former in the ninth grade, the latter in the tenth and eleventh. "Since the first objections were oral, the board and administrators were not prepared to handle the problem. The teachers were prepared to submit evaluations, but the board were just too confused to know what to do. They did not adopt the books. Shortly after this, I brought them the NCTE material which they adopted immediately. Since then we have had no problem with public criticism."

An unusually long response from one teacher included several interesting elements and is printed in full below. In this case, she recognized that, while the objectors may be identified only as parents, they may be members of, or use the materials of, organizations with extreme right-wing points of view. She also has developed her own system for coping with censorship pressures.

> A teacher in a large Far Western state received calls from parents objecting to three different books she had included in the recommended reading lists for her twelfth grade classes. Both Catcher in the Rye and 1984 were objected to as "obscene"; Crane's Red Badge of Courage was called "communistic." "The objector thought 'red badge' was a Russian decoration, so help me!" She checked "local organization" as well as "parents" as original objectors and included the following marginal note about the organizations: "Their names are legion (Anti-Communist Study Group, Americanism Center, etc.). All, of course, are Birch types, with leadership holding membership in Birch society. Parents object, but they work from organizational lists of undesirable books." "Because of organized attempts at censorship, I began three years ago to send reading lists home to parents with a cover statement to the effect that a parent may strike any titles to which he objects for *his* son or daughter. When I get a call now, I offer to supply them a list of *all* parents' names so that the objector can call them all to tell them that

> they aren't competent to select for their children, but that he (the objector) volunteers to serve in loco parentis. It's sort of fun. It doesn't follow our NCTE recommended course of action, but I would use it if my own didn't work. So far it has."

Other teachers reported that they or their schools used similar procedures for preventing objections.

> One such report noted that "at the beginning of the year, we send home, to be signed, a statement that no child is ever to be required to read any book to which he or his parents object, that another assignment will gladly be made upon request, that we respect the rights of all to read, and we do not want to hamper any student either by denying or forcing."

The right of the parent to determine what his own child should not read was supported by several teachers in their reports.

> In a Midwestern community, a parent objected to her child's reading Pearl Buck's The Good Earth because of the passages dealing with concubines. The book had been selected by the student from her eleventh grade reading list. "Principal, librarian and I discussed mother's letter. Agreed she had a right to determine her child's reading. Ignored her demand that book be removed from the library. We felt she had no right to determine what other people's children should read."

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

According to the questionnaire respondents, public criticism of local schools was widespread. While textbooks were among the common subjects of complaint, they were outranked in frequency of mention by school costs, policies, curricula, and teachers; English textbooks were outranked by those in Social Studies. Nevertheless, more than one-tenth of the public school English teachers who responded reported that, during the two year period studied, they had been involved personally in at least one censorship incident.

Incidents were reported from all sections of the country and involved teachers from a great variety of backgrounds, working in many different kinds of schools and communities. The incidents occurred in states with liberal policies in regard to adoption of books within local school districts, and in states with restrictive statewide adoption practices. They involved teachers with bachelor's degrees and those with doctorates; with liberal political views and with conservative; with majors in English and with unrelated majors; with less than one and more than twenty years of teaching experience.

The schools in which these teachers worked were of all sizes, with all types of curricula, and great variation in policies and procedures for selecting, using, and defending books used in the teaching of English. They varied, too, in the climate of freedom perceived by the teachers. The schools were located in communities that were urban, suburban, rural; ranged from less than 500 to more than 1 million in population; were politically liberal, conservative, and in the middle; and experienced much, some, little, and no public criticism of the local schools.

Despite this range of responses from the teachers with censorship experience, as a group they did differ from the teachers with no censorship experience to report--seen as a group. Compared to the teachers with no censorship incidents to report for the two year period studied, the teachers with censorship experience tended to have more education and more recent education. More of them majored in English and completed their highest degrees at a liberal arts college, rather than at a state or teachers college. They had less teaching experience to report, both in the field of English generally and in their present positions. They were more apt to be senior high school teachers, especially teachers of eleventh and twelfth grade classes; less apt to teach in junior high school.

Compared to the members of the "no censorship" group, they were more apt to consider themselves "liberal"; much less apt to choose the label "middle-of-the-road" to describe either themselves or the community in which they worked. More of them tended to see themselves as different from the community in which they taught in regard to social and political issues.

More of the "censorship" group were employed in suburban areas, and more in communities over 50,000 in population. These communities were more apt to be ones where there had been public criticism of the local schools, and where the criticism had been more intense. Textbooks were apt to rank higher on the list of subjects of criticism, and obscenity to lead the list of criticisms made of books.

Compared to the institutions where members of the "no censorship" group worked, the schools more often were moderately large (1500-3499 pupils), less often were very small (under 500). They tended to include two or three curricular tracks rather than one, and these were more apt to include a college preparatory track. The school was more apt to have a policy for dealing with public complaints about schoolbooks, and the teachers in the "censorship" group were more apt to know about it.

The teachers with censorship experience seemed to use more literary material in teaching. In addition to using literature textbooks, more of them also used other required readings, recommended readings, and literature to be selected by the student (free reading). In their schools, textbooks and required or recommended readings used in addition to the textbooks were less apt to be selected by the individual teacher (either through a free choice or from an approved list); more apt to be selected by a committee or the faculty of the department. Although they felt that they had a good deal of freedom in professional matters, the teachers in the "censorship" group generally felt that they had less freedom than those in the "no censorship" group to determine course content and teaching methods, and to select instructional materials.

Despite the range and variety of incidents reported, a summary can be made by selecting the most frequent response to each relevant question. The books in question most often were American novels published since 1940, with Catcher in the Rye receiving far more attention than any other single work. Parents were the most frequent objectors, making their objections known to either the principal or the superintendent in a personal conference. Typically they objected to the "vulgarity" of the work, and to the "language" used in it. The book probably was being used in paperback form in the eleventh grade as required reading in addition to the literature textbook, and had been selected for that purpose by the teacher. Despite the objections raised, in the majority of cases, the book was retained for use as originally planned.

Conclusions

In general, the findings in this study are congruent with the results of other studies, the conclusions of experienced observers, and the tentative hypotheses or assumptions of this investigator. How far these data can be extended to apply to any population other than the one from which the sample was drawn cannot be estimated, but this kind of validation encourages belief in their wider applicability.

On the question of the incidence of censorship, however, no two studies agree; no two studies used the same method of assessment or achieved the same rate of response. It is predictable that the incidence will be higher when a study is concerned with the number of schools or school districts where at least one censorship incident has occurred than when a study is made of the experience of individual teachers. It also is probable that the percentage of censorship reports will decrease as the total percentage of response increases. (The hypothesis here is that those teachers who have censorship experience to report are more apt to respond than are those with nothing to report.)

What is important is that people using these statistics use them responsibly, making clear their derivation. This has not been the case in many instances where educators as well as newspapermen have discussed censorship. For example, incidence figures of twenty and thirty per cent have been taken out of context of the original state studies and applied to the national population of English teachers. In the opinion of this writer, based upon a combination of research and impressionistic data, a more accurate incidence figure for all English teachers probably is ten per cent. One in every ten public school teachers of English probably has experienced some form of overt censorship pressure within any recent one or two year period. And, while an incidence figure of ten per cent is not nearly so disturbing as twenty or thirty per cent, it certainly is sufficient to warrant concern.

That the censorship incidents for the most part were relatively quiet, undramatic events is made clear in these data. The bomb threats, mass meetings, even newspaper reports were few in number. Unfortunately, however, it is the latter kind of incident which--because of widespread publicity--can trigger events in other areas, or cause an increase in "caution" and pre-censorship by teachers. As noted in the earlier discussion of the limitations of this study, these findings cannot indicate the extent of pre-censorship, the instances where a teacher avoids using or stops using material because of the possibility of question or controversy.

One of the most positive conclusions to be drawn from the study is that the teachers involved in the censorship situations did not seem to "deserve" to be censored--or, more accurately, to have their teaching materials censored. In general they were not just beginning teachers, or teachers in their first year or two in a new situation, who might be expected to make some errors in professional judgments. Nor were they teachers who selected highly controversial material, or material obviously unsuited to the grade level where it was used.

Instead, it appears from the data available that these English teachers were the object of censorship pressures because they were doing a good job of teaching English. Generally they were better prepared for their positions than were the group of teachers with no censorship experience to report. A large percentage of them had majored in the subject they were teaching, and had completed an advanced degree in either a university or liberal arts college program. The books they selected were included in widely used and respected lists of recommended readings for the particular age group involved. They utilized not only literature textbooks in their courses, but also other literary materials in a variety of ways. They tried to introduce their students not only to the classics of British literature, but also to American literature--especially modern American literature.

Those teachers who reported censorship experience often were ones who used practices which supposedly help to prevent censorship attempts. As noted above, many of the books were ones included in professionally recommended guides; in a number of instances the books were selected by a committee of teachers rather than by the individual teacher, or were selected by the teacher from an approved list. The books were not made required reading for every student in the particular course; the censored books just as often were ones which had been selected by the student from a list of recommended readings, or ones which he had selected on his own as free reading.

In half of the instances reported, the would-be censors were parents. (No other objectors accounted for even ten per cent of the responses.) This seems to give support to the contention that organized groups tend to be concerned most with political and social ideology and, therefore, with books used in the Social Sciences; that parents are concerned most with "morality" and, therefore, with works of fiction used in the English curriculum. There is no way to determine from the findings whether these parents were acting solely as individuals, from personal and individual motivations, or whether in some situations they were members of--or at least inspired to act by--social, political, patriotic, or religious organizations with policies and programs related to books available in the school and community. Whatever moved these parents to action, one can only assume that their intentions were honest, their motivation good, whether or not one agrees with their goals and methods.

They appear to have been distressed primarily by the use of realistic modern American fiction in English classes, selecting only specific aspects or passages which they objected to as "vulgar" and "immoral," rather than objecting to the books as wholes. It is very probable that these works were not included in the curriculum when they --the parents--were students in high school. In many cases they had not read the books prior to reporting their objections.

American literature, especially modern American literature, is being included in the departmental offerings of more and more undergraduate and graduate school English departments. An increasing number of English teachers each year becomes familiar with this material, is prepared to teach it, and believes that it should be included in the high school curriculum. As teachers continue to extend their use of literary materials beyond the standard "safe" textbook collection to include some of the great range of works readily available in inexpensive, paperback form;

and especially as they use modern American novels in the course of their teaching high school English, this particular kind of censorship pressure probably will continue, perhaps will increase.

Within the profession of education, much attention in the recent past has been devoted to programs for coping with the attacks of organized groups; this has been necessary and important. Now it would seem desirable at least for those in the field of the teaching of English to concern themselves with the problem of dealing with the "quiet" censorship pressures of the kind described in this report.

For the institutions which train teachers, this should underscore the importance of providing future teachers with a strong background in literature as well as in the methods of teaching literature. It suggests special emphasis upon helping teachers learn to select books on the basis of professional criteria; to know why and how they plan to use the books they select; and to select books that are suitable for the individual students they teach.

The major burden of defense against censorship must, of course, be carried by the teacher. Careful selection of materials, reading programs tailored to the needs and maturity levels of individual students, and recommended reading lists which offer students a choice of books not only are sound educational methods, but also are ways to guard against some censorship pressures. But teachers must be willing to defend the books they select; to fight against the gradual erosion of the English curriculum that is the result of pre-censorship or of surrender to quiet censorship pressures.

Within their departments and their school systems, teachers need to urge the adoption of clear cut book selection practices and of policies and procedures for dealing with complaints about books. One of the most discouraging findings of this study was not only that a fairly low percentage of the schools represented had an established policy for dealing with public complaints about textbooks, but also that a large percentage of the teachers responding did not know whether their schools had such a policy. Teachers should not wait until a major censorship incident occurs to push for the formulation of procedures for dealing with censorship pressures.

One of the encouraging discoveries was that almost three-fourths of the books reported were retained for use after having been challenged. However, a related finding is considerably less positive: where complaints were made to school administrators or boards of education, the result was much more apt to be the removal of the questioned book than when the complaint was made to the teacher. Perhaps this was because the more determined censors called administrators and boards, and those with somewhat milder complaints talked with teachers. Another strong possibility is that administrators or board members were less familiar with the material being taught, less concerned about defending it, and more interested in placating a member of the community. If this latter hypothesis has validity, it suggests that teachers need to "educate" administrators and board members in regard to the literature program, as well as to work for policies and practices that respect the professional integrity of teachers.

The findings also obviously suggest a strong need for education of the parents, of the lay community. In case after case, where a teacher, department chairman, or teacher and administrator together had an opportunity to discuss the book in question and its use directly with the parent who objected, the situation was resolved with no further difficulty. Teachers should use PTA meetings and any other media available to them to communicate with parents about the school literature program. Where the objectors are parents, the procedures for dealing with complaints should include an opportunity for the teachers involved to talk with the parents as well as with the administrators who receive the complaints.

None of the foregoing statements should be construed as meaning that teachers always are "right" or that any question raised about the books used by a teacher automatically is to be considered a censorship attempt. Lay control of public education is basic in American educational philosophy and practice, and the right of the layman--most especially the parent--to raise questions about public education in general, and his local school system in particular, cannot be denied. Indeed, local educators should encourage the kind of interest and involvement by parents and other members of the community that will produce searching, challenging questions. And these questions, when honestly asked, deserve honest consideration and answer. Questions about, or objections to, books should not necessarily be resolved by the removal of the book from the curriculum, but neither should they be met with the assumption that teachers cannot err in professional judgments or professional activities.

Nor should questions and objections raised by administrators, librarians, or teachers outside the discipline of English immediately be labeled as censorship or interference with the rights of the teachers of literature. The definition of censorship which served as the basis of this study had at its core the negative concept of non-professional standards and methods used to reject or eliminate works of literature. But books selected without reference to educational and literary criteria, assigned indiscriminately without regard to the intellectual or maturational level of students, taught without sensitivity and skill by unperceptive or poorly trained teachers, cannot be defended. Unfortunately the state of the profession at present is not such that it can be assumed that all or even most teachers of high school English are adequately prepared and competent to select and teach works of literature. Poor choices will be made; good choice will be poorly taught.

This presents a double challenge to the profession--and particularly to the association which represents and serves this profession, the National Council of Teachers of English. Good teachers need to be strengthened and given help in their defense of new methods and new materials in the teaching of English; the pre-service and in-service education and the certification of teachers need to be improved. Current publications and activities of both the national and local councils show that this challenge has been recognized.

A study such as this one is only a first step toward greater understanding of the problems of censorship faced by teachers of English. The phenomenon of pre-censorship by English teachers themselves should be examined. What are the attitudes of teachers toward book selection and use? What materials are teachers using? Are the same materials being used by teachers who have had no censorship experience as by those who have been involved in censorship incidents? Is it the book itself or the way in which it is taught that causes problems?

More than two-thirds of the books objected to in this study were being used in paperback form. Is this because that many books used in English classes today ordinarily are in paperback, or do paperback books attract more critical attention? Do students or parents react differently to paperback books than to hardcover? Is there some "paperback psychology" which should be recognized? Do community "clean book" drives against neighborhood paperback and magazine stores trigger reactions to paperbacks used in schools?

It was hoped that this study would serve as a basis for further investigation; these are only two suggestions of possible avenues for exploration. If this study can both spur further research and, in itself, be of some help to teachers of English in their fight against censorship, it will have served its purpose.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahrens, Maurice. "Freedom to Learn: Censorship and Learning Materials." Social Education, 17:165-70, April 1953.

American Book Publishers Council, Inc. Freedom-to-Read Bulletin, 5:1-12, March 1962. Entire issue.

American Book Publishers Council, Inc. Freedom-to-Read Bulletin, 6:1-12, Fall 1963. Entire issue.

American Civil Liberties Union. Combatting Undemocratic Pressures on Schools and Libraries: A Guide for Local Communities. New York, The Union, 1964. 15 p.

American Civil Liberties Union. Obscenity and Censorship: Two Statements of the American Civil Liberties Union. New York, The Union, March 1963. 8 p.

American Legion. Department of Michigan. "Evaluation of Instructional Materials." Resolution adopted at Convention, Grand Rapids, Michigan, August 19-22, 1948. 4 p. Mimeographed.

American Library Association Council. "How Libraries and Schools Can Resist Censorship." Statement adopted by the Council, February 1, 1962. Distributed by the National Education Association, Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities, No imprint. 2 p.

American Library Association and American Book Publishers Council. "The Freedom to Read." A statement prepared by the Westchester Conference of the Association and the Council, May 2-3, 1953. 8 p.

America's Future, Inc. Textbook Evaluation Committee. "Textbook Evaluation Report on Guide to Modern English by Richard K. Corbin and Porter G. Perrin." Reviewed by E. Merrill Root. n.d. 3 p. Mimeographed.

Asheim, Lester. "Not Censorship But Selection." Reprinted from Wilson Library Bulletin, September 1953. 5 p.

Ayres, Donald L. "Censorship of Literature as a Curriculum Problem." Journal of Secondary Education, 37:61-63, January 1962.

Ayres, Donald L. "What Can the Teacher Do?" NEA Journal, 52:24-5, May 1963.

Bach, Harry. "Censorship of Library Books and Textbooks in American Schools." Journal of Secondary Education, 40:3-15, January 1965.

Barr, Arvil S., Robert A. Davis and Palmer O. Johnson. Educational Research and Appraisal. Chicago, J. B. Lippincott Company, 1953. 362 p.

Best, John W. Research in Education. New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1959. 320 p.

Blanshard, Paul. The Right to Read: The Battle Against Censorship. Boston, The Beacon Press, 1955. 339 p.

Booth, Wayne C. "Censorship and the Values of Fiction." The English Journal, 53:155-164, March 1964.

Borg, Walter R. Educational Research: An Introduction. New York, David McKay Company, Inc., 1963. 418 p.

Boutwell, William D. "What's Happening in Education?" The PTA Magazine, 56:15-16, April 1962.

Burress, Lee A., Jr. How Censorship Affects the School. Wisconsin Council of Teachers of English, Special Bulletin No. 8, Oshkosh, The Council, October 1963. 23 p.

Chandos, John, ed. 'To Deprave and Corrupt. . .': Original Studies in the Nature and Definition of Obscenity. New York, Association Press, 1962. 207 p.

Chisolm, Francis P. "Notes on Censorship." Wisconsin English Journal, 6:3-5, October 1963.

Clark, Thomas D. "Serious Threats to American Education from Fanatic Fringes and Critics." Paper read at the NEA Convention, Detroit, Michigan, July 4, 1963. 8 p. Multilithed.

Clements, Robert J. "Forbidden Books and Christian Reunion." Columbia University Forum, Summer 1963, p. 26-31.

Columbia University. Bureau of Applied Social Research. "Training Guide on Constructing Questionnaires and Interview Schedules." New York, Columbia University, Bureau of Applied Social Research, 1948. 95 p. Mimeographed.

Corbett, Edward P. J. "Raise High the Barriers, Censors." America, January 7, 1961, p. 441-443.

Curry, William Lee. "Comstockery: A Study in the Rise and Decline of a Watchdog Censorship." Ph.D. Dissertation. New York, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1957. 273 p. Typewritten.

Daniels, Walter M., ed. The Censorship of Books. New York, The H. W. Wilson Company, 1954. 202 p.

David, Clement, F.S.C. "From Practices to Assumptions." The Catholic Educational Review, 61:328-334, May 1963.

Douglas, William O. Freedom of the Mind. Reading for An Age of Change Series, No. 3. American Library Association, distributed by the Public Affairs Committee, Inc., New York, c1962. 44 p.

Downs, Robert B., ed. The First Freedom: Liberty and Justice in the World of Books and Reading. Chicago, American Library Association, 1960. 469 p.

Ehlers, Henry and Gordon C. Lee, eds. "Part 1: Freedom in Education." Crucial Issues in Education. New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1959. p. 13-100.

Esbenson, Thorwald. "How Far Have the Book Burners Gone?" School Executive, 76:69-71, May 1957.

Fine, Benjamin. "The Truth About Schoolbook Censorship." Parents Magazine, 27:464, December 1952.

Fiske, Marjorie. Book Selection and Censorship: A Study of School and Public Libraries in California. Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1959. 145 p.

Flexner, Stuart. "The Man Who Corrupted California." Esquire, 82-83, 151-155, March 1964.

FOI Digest. Vols. 1-4, 1960-1963. Vol. 5, nos. 1-4, January 1 - February 15, 1964.

Gardiner, Harold C., S.J. Catholic Viewpoint on Censorship. New York, Hanover House, 1958. 192 p.

Gardiner, Harold C., S.J. "Words and Conscience." America, January 7, 1961, p. 444.

Garner, Jefferson L. "Meeting the Textbook Controversy." Journal of Secondary Education, 37:52-56, January 1962.

Good, Carter V. and Douglas E. Scates. Methods of Research: Educational, Psychological, Sociological. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954. 920 p.

Goode, William J. and Paul K. Hatt. Methods in Social Research. New York, McGraw-Hill Company, Inc., 1952. 386 p.

Gordon, Edward. "Freedom to Teach and to Learn." The PTA Magazine, 58:4-7, October 1963.

Gordon, Edward. "The Teacher and the Censor." Alexander Butman, Donald Reis, and David Sohn, eds. Paperbacks in the Schools. New York, Bantam Books, 1963. p. 62-72.

Gordon, Rosalie M. What's Happened to Our Schools? New Rochelle, New York, America's Future, Inc., c1956. 22 p.

Gregory, Ruth, comp. "Readings on Book Selection and Intellectual Freedom, 1954-1961." ALA Bulletin, 56: 145-49, February 1962.

Gross, Elbert. "The Scarsdale Controversy: 1948-1954." Ph.D. Dissertation. New York, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1958. 231 p. Typewritten.

Group Research, Inc. "The Right Wing: A Bibliography." Washington, D.C., Group Research, Inc., April 1963. 4 p. Mimeographed.

"Guidelines for Textbook Selection." Report of the Joint Committee of the National Education Association and the American Textbook Publishers Institute. Washington, D.C., National Education of the United States, c1963. 30 p.

Haight, Anne Lyon. Banned Books: Informal Notes on Some Books Banned for Various Reasons at Various Times and in Various Places. New York, R. R. Bowker Company, 1955. 172 p.

Hamburg, Morris. "The Case of the Subversive Text." The School Executive, 77:59-61, April 1958.

Haney, Robert W. Comstockery in America: Patterns of Censorship and Control. Boston, Beacon Press, 1960. 199 p.

Hardesty, Cecil D. "A Commitment to American Ideals: Freedom to Teach, to Learn, and to Think Critically." Journal of Secondary Education, 37:43-46, January 1962.

Harwood, E. L. "Textbook Evaluation." [Compiled by Mrs. Harry Bunnenberg, Vernon, Texas, Member of John David Chapter, D.A.R.] No imprint. 5 p. Mimeographed.

Hodges, Elizabeth D. "What Can the Library Committee Do?" NEA Journal, 52: 25-6, May 1963.

Holmes, John Haynes. "Sensitivity as Censor." Saturday Review, 32: 9-10+, February 26, 1949.

Hook, Sidney. "Pornography and the Censor." New York Times, April 12, 1964, sec. 7, p. 1, 38-39.

Hyman, Herbert. Survey Design and Analysis: Principles, Cases and Procedures. Glencoe, Illinois, The Free Press, 1955. 425 p.

Jennison, Peter. Freedom to Read. Public Affairs Pamphlet No. 344. New York, Public Affairs Committee, 1963. 20 p.

Jones, Kitty. How "Progressive" is Your School? New Rochelle, New York, America's Future, Inc., c1954. 12 p.

Kandel, I. L. "Freedom of Reading and the Future of Democracy." School and Society, 78: 43-4, August 8, 1953.

Kegler, Stanley B. and Stephen Dunning. "A Minority Report on Censorship." The English Journal, 51: 667-668, December 1962.

Kennedy, Renwick C. "Alabama Book Toasters." The Christian Century, 71: 428-9, April 7, 1954.

Kerber, August and Wilfred R. Smith. Educational Issues in a Changing Society. Detroit, Wayne State University Press, 1962. 477 p.

Kinnaird, Virginia. "Extremists Attacks Upon the Curriculum: A Local School System Faces Up to the Problem." Paper read at AASA Meeting, Atlantic City, New Jersey, February 17, 1964. 14 p. Dittoed.

King, Joseph A. "Birchers Try to Burn a Dictionary." Visalia, California, August 1, 1963, 10 p. Mimeographed.

Koos, Leonard B. The Questionnaire in Education. New York, Macmillan Company, 1928. 178 p.

Kvaraceus, William C. "Can Reading Affect Delinquency?" Paper read to the Conference on Intellectual Freedom, American Library Association, Washington, D.C., January 23, 1965. Mimeographed.

Lacy, Dan. Freedom and Communications. Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1961. 93 p.

Lacy, Dan. "Problems of American Freedom: 1. Freedom of the Press." Reprinted from Religion in Life, Winter 1960-61. New York, Abingdon Press, 1960. 11 p.

Lasswell, Harold D. "Censorship." Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. 1930. p. 290-294.

Love, Owen. "Censorship--Whether and Why." Draft of a memorandum in preparation for the Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities, National Education Association, January 15, 1964. 6 p. Dittoed.

McCormick, John and Mairi MacInnes, eds. Versions of Censorship. Garden City, New York, Anchor Books, Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1962. 374 p.

McKeon, Richard, Robert K. Merton, and Walter Gellhorn. The Freedom to Read: Perspective and Program. New York, Published for the National Book Committee by R. R. Bowker Company, 1957. 110 p.

McNamara, Robert C. "What Can the Publisher Do?" NEA Journal, 52: 27-28, May 1963.

Merritt, LeRoy Charles. "The Right to Read." CTA Journal, 61:18-20+, January 1965.

National Council of Churches of Christ in America. "Censorship Issues." Bureau of Research and Survey. Information Service, 39:1-8, December 24, 1960. Entire issue.

National Council of Jewish Women. "Censorship and Complacency in Education." Council Platform, 7:1-4, May 1963. Entire issue.

National Council of Teachers of English. Books for You: A List for Leisure Reading For Use by Students in Senior High Schools. Champaign, Illinois, The Council, 1959. 155 p.

National Council of Teachers of English. "Book Selection and Censorship." Council-Grams, 25:1-19, February 1964. Entire issue.

National Council of Teachers of English. "Censorship and the Right to Read: A Bibliography." Champaign, Illinois, The Council, n.d. 3 p. Mimeographed.

National Council of Teachers of English. Discussions of "Book Selection and Censorship," PRR-Affiliate Breakfast, Fifty-Third Annual Meeting, National Council of Teachers of English, San Francisco, California, November 30, 1963. Recorders' notes. Files of the Council. Handwritten.

National Council of Teachers of English. "Guide for Discussion on 'Book Selection and Censorship.'" Distributed, PRR-Affiliate Breakfast, NCTE Fifty-Third Annual Meeting, San Francisco, November 30, 1963. 1 p. Multilithed.

National Council of Teachers of English. "Resolution on Censorship, 1960." Champaign, Illinois, The Council, n.d. 1 p. Mimeographed.

National Council of Teachers of English. Committee on Censorship of Teaching Materials for Classroom and Library. Censorship and Controversy. Chicago, The Council, 1953. 56 p.

National Council of Teachers of English. Committee on the Right to Read. The Students' Right to Read. Champaign, Illinois, 1962. 21 p.

National Education Association. National Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education. Defense Bulletin, Number 85, June 1960. 8 p.

National Education Association. National Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education. NEA Defense Commission Handbook: Local, State, National. Washington, D.C., The Association, 1959. 48 p.

National Education Association. Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education. "State of the Nation in Regard to Attacks on the Schools and Problems of Concern to Teachers." Washington, D.C., The Commission, December 1955. 8 p. Multilithed.

National Education Association. Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education. "State of the Nation in Regard to Attacks on the Schools and Problems of Concern to Teachers." State of the Nation Bulletin No. 2. Washington, D.C., The Commission, 1959. 10 p. Multilithed.

National Education Association. Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education. "State of the Nation in Regard to Criticisms of the Schools and Problems of Concern to Teachers." State of the Nation Bulletin No. 3. Washington, D.C., The Commission, January 1961, 8 p. Multilithed.

National Education Association. Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education. Stewardship Report of the Defense Commission. Washington, D.C., The Association, 1962. 32 p.

National Education Association. Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities. "State of the Nation in Regard to Criticisms of the Schools and Problems of Concern to Teachers." State of the Nation Bulletin No. 4. Washington, D.C., The Commission, February 1963. 11 p. Multilithed.

National Education Association. Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities. "Criticisms and Defense of Public Education." Books and Book Reviews, Annual Edition, September 1962-September 1963. Washington, D.C., The Association, October 17, 1963.

National Education Association. Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities. Defense Bulletin, Number 94, February 1963. 8 p.

National Education Association. Research Division. "Textbook Selection." Research Memo 1962-27. Revised by Beatrice C. Lee, July 1965. 12 p. Multilithed.

National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution. National Defense Committee. "Textbook Study 1958-59." Washington, D.C., The Society, n.d. 20 p.

Nelson, Jack. "What is the Problem?" NEA Journal, 52:19-21, May 1963.

Nelson, Jack and Gene Roberts, Jr. The Censors and the Schools. Boston, Little, Brown and Company, 1963. 208 p.

Noonan, Eileen F., comp. A Basic Book Collection for High Schools. Seventh edition. Chicago, American Library Association, 1963. 184 p.

Oliva, Peter F. "The Dilemma of Censorship." Educational Forum, 25:499-502, May 1961.

Olson, Enid M. "Do Teachers Encroach on the Student's Right to Read?" Paper read at Sixth Annual Freedom of Information Conference, University of Missouri, Columbia, November 7-8, 1963. Typewritten.

Olson, Enid M. "To Follow Knowledge . . ." Paper read to the Chicago Archdiocesan Association of Teachers of English, Regina Dominican High School, Wilmett, Illinois, March 23, 1963. Typewritten.

Ozmon, Howard A., Jr. "Better Dead Than Well Read?" Phi Delta Kappan, 63: 222-223, February 1962.

Parten, Mildred. Surveys, Polls, and Samples: Practical Procedures. New York, Harper and Brothers, 1950. 624 p.

Rafferty, Max and Thomas Braden. "Should Schoolmen Serve as Censors?" The Nation's Schools, 74:62-4, September 1964.

Raywid, Mary Anne. "Coping with Attacks on the Curriculum from the 'Fanatic Fringe.'" Speech read at AASA Convention, Atlantic City, New Jersey, February 18, 1963. 20 p.

Raywid, Mary Anne. The Ax-Grinders: Critics of our Public Schools. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1962. 260 p.

Riesman, David. Constraint and Variety in American Education. Lincoln, Nebraska, University of Nebraska Press, 1956. 160 p.

Roberts, Gene, Jr. "The Censors and the Schools." Paper read at the Convention of the National Education Association, Detroit, Michigan, July 4, 1963. 7 p.

Sauer, Edwin H. English in the Secondary School. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961. 245 p.

Serviss, Trevor K. "Freedom to Learn: Censorship in Learning Materials." Social Education, 17:65-70, February 1953.

Shaplen, Robert. "Scarsdale's Battle of the Books." Commentary, 10:530-540, December 1950.

Shaw, Archibald B. "Censorship of Materials and Program." Paper read at the Convention of the National Education Association, Detroit, Michigan, July 4, 1963. 6 p.

Shaw, Archibald B. "What Can the Superintendent Do?" NEA Journal, 52:22-23, May 1963.

Shor, Rachel, ed. Standard Catalog for High School Libraries. 1964 Supplement to the Eighth Edition, 1962. New York, The H. W. Wilson Company, 1964. 104 p.

Shor, Rachel and Estelle A. Fidell, eds. Standard Catalog for High School Libraries. 1963 Supplement to the Eighth Edition, 1962. New York, The H. W. Wilson Company, 1963. 114 p.

Smelser, Joseph N. "Who Should Read What?" Arizona Teacher, 51:14, 25, May 1963.

Speeches, First Annual Freedom of Information Conference, School of Journalism, University of Missouri, Columbia, December 11-12, 1958. Columbia, Missouri, The Freedom of Information Center, 1959.

Speeches, Second Annual Freedom of Information Conference, School of Journalism, University of Missouri, Columbia, November 5-6, 1959. Columbia, Missouri, The Freedom of Information Center, 1960.

Speeches, Sixth Annual Freedom of Information Conference, School of Journalism, University of Missouri, Columbia, November 7-8, 1963. Columbia, Missouri, The Freedom of Information Center, 1964.

"'The Right to Read': The NCTE Speaks Out on Censorship." The Modern Language Journal, 67:70-71, February 1963.

"The Questionnaire." Research Bulletin of the N.E.A., 8:1-51, January 1930. Entire issue.

Van Dalen, Deobold B. Understanding Educational Research: An Introduction. With two chapters by William J. Meyer. New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962. 432 p.

West, Dorothy H., Estelle A. Fidell and Rachel Shor, eds. Standard Catalog for High School Libraries. New York, The H. W. Wilson Company, 1962. 1055 p.

Widmer, Kingsley and Eleanor. Literary Censorship: Principles, Cases, Problems. San Francisco, Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1961. 182 p.

Withey, Stephen. "Survey Research Methods." Encyclopedia of Educational Research. 3rd ed. 1960. p. 1447-1452.

Wyatt, Robert H. "Coping with the Vigilantes, Censors, and Critics in 1963." Paper read at NEA Convention, Detroit, Michigan, July 4, 1963. 3 p. Multilithed.

Young, Pauline V. Scientific Social Surveys and Research. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1956. 540 p.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

200 East 74 Street
New York 21, New York
April 22, 1964

To Members of the English Institute,
Teachers College, Columbia University

Dear Institute Member:

As part of my doctoral program at Teachers College, I am making a study of the problems of censorship faced by teachers of English today. Much of my data will be collected through the use of a mailed questionnaire to be sent to a nationwide sample of secondary school English teachers. I hope that you consider this project of sufficient significance to be willing to pre-test a draft of the proposed questionnaire.

I shall be most grateful if you will answer the questions on the enclosed questionnaire, placing an "X" to the left of any items which seem to you to be unclear or confusing. If you have time to make additional comments or suggestions on the final sheet, these will be of further help in revising the questionnaire.

A stamped self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your use. I look forward to receiving your response and appreciate your cooperation.

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) Nyla J. Ahrens

Enclosures (2)

SAMPLE SURVEY OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH

1. Which of the following statements applies to you?

   ___I am currently employed as a teacher of English in a public secondary school.
   ___I am not currently employed as a teacher of English in a public secondary school; therefore, I am returning this questionnaire to you unanswered.

2. What is your educational background?

   ___Normal school degree or equivalent
   Year completed______Institution___________________Major______
   ___Bachelor's degree or equivalent
   Year completed______Institution___________________Major______
   ___Master's degree or equivalent
   Year completed______Institution___________________Major______
   ___Graduate work beyond the master's degree

3. How long have you taught English? _____years

4. How long have you held your present position? _____years

5. On which grade level(s) are you teaching English at present?

   ___7 ___8 ___9 ___10 ___11 ___12

6. What official assignment(s) do you have at present other than teaching English?

7. In regard to social and political issues, how would you describe yourself?

   ___very conservative ___conservative ___middle-of-the-road
   ___very liberal ___liberal

8. In what type of school are you teaching at present?

   ___senior high school ___junior high school ___junior-senior high
   ___other (please specify):

9. Which of the following curricula are provided in the school?

   ___commercial ___general ___college preparatory

10. What is the approximate enrollment in the school? _____students

11. In what type of community is the school in which you teach located?

    ___urban ___suburban ___rural

12. What is the approximate size of the community? _____residents

13. In regard to social and political issues, how would you describe the community?

___very conservative ___conservative ___middle-of-the-road
___very liberal ___liberal

14. During the past two years, has there been destructive criticism of the public schools within the community?

___much ___little ___none (If "none," skip to question 18.)

15. What was the subject of this criticism? (Check all items which apply.)

___school costs
___general school policies
___textbooks, curriculum
___teachers, administrators
___other (please specify):

___don't know

16. If textbooks were criticized, in which curricular area(s)?

___Social Studies
___English
___Math
___Science
___other (please specify):

___don't know

17. What criticism was made of the books?

___out of date
___inaccurate
___poorly written
___Communistic, Socialistic
___Un-American, not patriotic
___inadequate coverage of material
___obscene, vulgar
___other (please specify):

___don't know

18. Does your school have an established policy or set of procedures for handling complaints from the public about books used in the school?

___yes ___no ___don't know

19. If your answer to the previous question was "yes," briefly describe the procedures.

20. Which of the following do you use in the English courses you teach?

___literature textbook
___grammar textbook and/or workbook
___required readings in literature other than textbook
___recommended readings in literature
___free reading (literature selected by student)

21. How are the textbooks you use selected?

22. If you use required and/or recommended readings in addition to a textbook, how are these selected?

23. In your opinion, how much freedom do individual teachers in your school have in relation to the courses they teach:

to determine course content? ___much ___little ___none
to determine teaching methods? ___much ___little ___none
to select instructional materials? ___much ___little ___none

24. During the past two years, has anyone specifically objected to, or asked for the removal of, any book(s) which you have used or proposed using in the English courses you teach?

___yes ___no (If "no," skip to number 35.)

25. If your answer to the previous question was "yes," please list below each book to which some objection was made.

Author: Title:

26. To which of the above books was an objection raised most recently?

*Please answer the remaining questions in relation to that book.

27. Who raised the original objection?

___student
___parent
___clergyman
___another teacher
___English Department chairman
___principal, superintendent, other school administrator
___member of the Board of Education
___newspaper reporter or editor
___local organization (which organization?____________________)
___national organization (which one?____________________)
___other (please specify):

28. To whom was the original complaint or request made?

___directly to you
___Board of Education
___principal or superintendent
___English Department chairman
___other (please specify):

29. How was the original complaint or request made?

___by letter ___by phone ___in personal conference
___other (please specify):

30. What reason was given for the objection to the book?

31. How was the book in question being used at that time?

___textbook
___additional required reading
___recommended reading
___free reading (chosen by student)

32. Was the book in question printed in paperback or hardcover form?

___paperback ___hardcover

33. How was the book in question selected?

34. Please describe what happened after the initial objection was reported. What actions were taken by whom? What was the final outcome? (If you need more space than is provided here, use the reverse side of this sheet to continue.)

35. Thank you for completing the questionnaire. A stamped, addressed envelope is enclosed for your use in returning it to the sender.

QUESTIONNAIRE PRE-TEST EVALUATION

1. How long did it take you to complete this questionnaire? _____ minutes

2. Please note below any comments, criticisms, or suggestions you have in regard to the questionnaire as a whole or to individual items within it.

3. If you would like to receive a copy of the final, printed version of this questionnaire, please write your name and mailing address below.

____

____

____

APPENDIX B

May 5, 1964

Dear NCTE Member:

The enclosed survey questionnaire is being sent to selected members of the secondary section of the National Council of Teachers of English. I am conducting this survey as part of my doctoral program in the Department of English and Foreign Languages at Teachers College under the sponsorship of Professors Louis Forsdale and Robert Shafer.

If you will complete this questionnaire and return it to me at your earliest convenience, I shall be grateful. Teachers who pre-tested the questionnaire report that it requires approximately ten minutes to complete.

If you are not at present a teacher of English in a public secondary school, will you kindly check the appropriate answer to the first question and return the questionnaire. Your response will be important in the final tabulation of returns.

A stamped, self-addressed envelope is included for your use. I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) Nyla J. Ahrens

Enclosures (2)

SURVEY OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH

1. Which of the following statements applies to you?

____I am currently employed as a teacher of English in a public secondary school.
____I am not currently employed as a teacher of English in a public secondary school; therefore I am returning the questionnaire to you unanswered.

2. What is the highest degree you hold?

____Normal school degree or equivalent credits
____Bachelor's degree or equivalent credits
____Master's degree or equivalent credits
____Doctoral degree or equivalent credits

3. Year completed______Institution____________________Major______________

4. How long have you taught English? _________years

5. How long have you held your present position? _________years

6. On which grade level(s) are you teaching English at present? _________grade(s)

7. In regard to social and political issues, how would you describe yourself?

_____conservative _____middle-of-the-road _____liberal

8. Which of the following curricula are provided in the school in which you teach?

_____commercial _____general _____college preparatory

9. What is the approximate enrollment in the school? _________students

10. In what type of school is the school located?

_____urban _____suburban _____rural

11. What is the approximate size of the community? _________residents

12. In regard to social and political issues, how would you describe the community?

_____conservative _____middle-of-the-road _____liberal

13. During the past two years, has there been public criticism of the schools within the community?

_____much _____some _____little _____none (If "none," skip to question 17.)

14. What was the subject of this criticism? (Check all items which apply.)

_____school costs
_____curriculum
_____textbooks
_____teachers

_____other (specify):

_____don't know

15. If textbooks were criticized, in which curricular area? (Check all which apply.)

_____Social Studies
_____English
_____Math
_____Science

_____other (specify):

_____don't know

16. What criticism was made of the books? (Check all items which apply.)

_____out of date
_____inaccurate
_____poorly written
_____Communistic, Socialistic
_____Un-American, not patriotic

_____inadequate coverage of material
_____obscene, vulgar
_____other (specify):

_____don't know

17. Does your school have an established policy or set of procedures for handling complaints from the public about books used in the school?

_____yes _____no _____don't know

18. If your answer to the preceding question was "yes," briefly describe the policy or procedures.

19. Which of the following do you use in the English courses you teach?

_____literature textbook
_____grammar and/or language arts textbook
_____required readings in literature other than textbook
_____recommended readings in literature
_____free reading (literature selected by student)

20. How are the textbooks you use selected?

_____individual teacher has free choice
_____individual teacher selects from approved list
_____department faculty or committee makes selection
_____other (specify):

21. If you use required and/or recommended readings in addition to a textbook, how are these selected?

_____individual teacher has free choice
_____individual teacher selects from approved list
_____department committee or faculty makes selection
_____other (specify):

22. In your opinion, how much freedom do you have

to determine course content?	____much	____some	____little	____none
to determine teaching methods?	____much	____some	____little	____none
to select instructional materials?	____much	____some	____little	____none

23. During the past two years, has anyone specifically objected to, or asked for the removal of, any book(s) which you personally have used or proposed using in the English courses you teach?

____yes ____no (If "no," skip to number 34.)

24. If your answer to the preceding question was "yes," list below each book to which some objection was made. (If more than three, list the three most recent cases.)

Note: If you taught in a different school last year, list only those books to which someone objected this year.

Book 1: Author________________Title________________________________
Book 2: Author________________Title________________________________
Book 3: Author________________Title________________________________

ANSWER THE REMAINING QUESTIONS IN RELATION TO THE BOOK(S) LISTED ABOVE.

25. Who raised the original objection?

Book 1:	Book 2:	Book 3:	
____	____	____	student
____	____	____	parent
____	____	____	clergyman
____	____	____	another teacher
____	____	____	English department chairman
____	____	____	principal, other school administrator
____	____	____	member of the Board of Education
____	____	____	newspaper reporter or editor
____	____	____	local organization (which?____________________)
____	____	____	national organization (which?____________________)
____	____	____	other (specify):

26. To whom was the original objection reported?

Book 1:	Book 2:	Book 3:	
____	____	____	directly to you
____	____	____	Board of Education
____	____	____	principal or superintendent
____	____	____	English department chairman
____	____	____	other (specify):

27. How was the original objection reported?

Book 1:	Book 2:	Book 3:	
____	____	____	by letter
____	____	____	by phone
____	____	____	in personal conference
____	____	____	other (specify):

28. What reason was given for objecting to the book?

Book 1:____
Book 2:____
Book 3:____

29. How was the book in question being used or to be used?

Book 1:_____ Book 2:_____ Book 3:_____ textbook
_____ _____ _____ additional required reading
_____ _____ _____ recommended reading
_____ _____ _____ free reading (chosen by student)

30. On what grade level was the book in question being used or to be used?

Book 1:_________grade Book 2:_________grade Book 3:_________grade

31. How was the book in question selected?

Book 1:_____ Book 2:_____ Book 3:_____ by student (free choice)
_____ _____ _____ by student from recommended list
_____ _____ _____ by teacher (free choice)
_____ _____ _____ by teacher from approved list
_____ _____ _____ other (specify):

32. Was the book in question a paperback or hardcover book?

Book 1:_____ Book 2:_____ Book 3:_____ paperback
_____ _____ _____ hardcover

33. Please describe what happened after the initial objection was reported. What actions were taken by whom? What was the final outcome? (If you need more space than is provided here, feel free to attach another sheet.)

Book 1:

Book 2:

Book 3:

34. Thank you for completing the questionnaire. Kindly return it in the stamped, addressed envelope which is enclosed. All replies will be treated confidentially.

Code #

Mrs. Nyla J. Ahrens
Box 259, Lenox Hill Station
New York, N.Y. 10021

APPENDIX C

June 6, 1964

Dear NCTE Member:

Last month a copy of the enclosed "Survey of Teachers of English" was sent to you. Although more than sixty per cent of the survey questionnaires already have been returned, I have not as yet received yours. If you have posted your reply within the past few days, kindly ignore this letter and accept my thanks.

In case your original questionnaire has become lost amid final examinations and grade sheets, I am sending you this additional copy with the hope that your schedule soon will permit you to respond. A stamped, addressed envelope also is included for your use.

Again, I shall be grateful for your cooperation and look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) Nyla J. Ahrens

Enclosures (2)

APPENDIX D

TABLE XXXVII

INCIDENCE OF CENSORSHIP, BY STATES

State	Number Teaching	Teachers Reporting Censorship Incidents	
		Number	Per Cent
Alabama	5	0	0.0
Arizona	3	0	0.0
Arkansas	4	0	0.0
California	56	9	16.1
Colorado	8	2	25.0
Connecticut	12	2	16.7
Delaware	5	1	20.0
Dist. of Columbia	1	0	0.0
Florida	23	4	17.4
Georgia	9	0	0.0
Idaho	2	0	0.0
Illinois	32	4	12.5
Indiana	25	4	16.0
Iowa	13	0	0.0
Kansas	11	1	9.1
Kentucky	11	2	18.2
Louisiana	6	0	0.0
Maine	5	0	0.0

TABLE XXXVII (cont'd.)

State	Number Teaching	Teachers Reporting Censorship Incidents	
		Number	Per Cent
Maryland	12	2	16.7
Massachusetts	25	1	4.0
Michigan	25	5	20.0
Minnesota	23	3	13.1
Mississippi	4	2	50.0
Missouri	14	1	7.2
Montana	3	1	33.3
Nebraska	8	0	0.0
Nevada	2	1	50.0
New Hampshire	2	0	0.0
New Jersey	13	3	23.1
New Mexico	4	0	0.0
New York	51	8	15.7
North Carolina	11	0	0.0
North Dakota	1	0	0.0
Ohio	39	4	10.3
Oklahoma	10	1	10.0
Oregon	9	1	11.1
Pennsylvania	34	5	14.7
Rhode Island	2	0	0.0
South Carolina	3	0	0.0
South Dakota	3	0	0.0

TABLE XXXVII (cont'd.)

State	Number Teaching	Teachers Reporting Censorship Incidents	
		Number	Per Cent
Tennessee	9	1	11.1
Texas	32	1	3.1
Utah	3	0	0.0
Vermont	3	1	33.3
Virginia	9	1	11.1
Washington	14	3	21.4
West Virginia	2	0	0.0
Wisconsin	11	4	36.4
Wyoming	3	0	0.0

APPENDIX E

TABLE XXXVIII

CENSORED BOOKS: NUMBER OF OBJECTIONS, OBJECTORS, REASONS FOR OBJECTING

AUTHOR	TITLE	NO.*	OBJECTOR	OBJECTION
Bernstein, Leonard and Others	West Side Story	1	Parent	Vulgarity
Buck, Pearl	The Good Earth	3	Parent (3)	Specific incidents (2) Vulgarity
Budd, Lillian	April Snow	1	Parent	Specific incidents
Burdick, Eugene, and Wheeler, Harvey	Fail-Safe	1	Another teacher	Specific incidents
Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de	Don Quixote	1	Parent	Language; suitability
Clark, Walter	Oxbow Incident	2	Parent (2)	Language (2)
Crane, Stephen	The Red Badge of Courage	2	Parent Parent; local org.	Language Communism, leftism
DelCastillo, Michel	Child of Our Time	1	Parent	Language
Dos Passos, John	U.S.A.	1	Parent; clergyman; local organization	Communism, leftism

TABLE XXXVIII (cont'd.)

AUTHOR	TITLE	NO.*	OBJECTOR	OBJECTION
DuMaurier, Daphne	Rebecca	1	Parent	Other ("sex")
Fast, Howard	April Morning	1	Dept. chairman; Eng. Supervisor	Communism, leftism
Faulkner, William	Light in August	1	Parent; clergyman	Specific incidents
Ferber, Edna	Cimarron	1	Parent	Other ("cheap Western")
Fielding, Henry	Tom Jones	1	Department chairman	Vulgarity
Fitzgerald, F. Scott	Great Gatsby	1	Parent	Unknown
Frank, Anne	Diary of a Young Girl	5	Parent (4) Another	Suitability (3) Other: ("trash"), ("reading aloud")
Golding, William	Lord of the Flies	3	National organization Principal Other (Librarian)	Vulgarity Suitability Other: ("horrible, uninspiring")
Griffin, John	Black Like Me	1	Principal	Language
Guthrie, Alfred	The Way West	1	Student, parent	Vulgarity
Hawthorne, Nathaniel	Scarlet Letter	3	Parent (2) Other (Librarian)	Vulgarity (2) Suitability

TABLE XXXVIII (cont'd.)

AUTHOR	TITLE	NO.*	OBJECTOR	OBJECTION
Heggen, Thomas	Mister Roberts	1	Another teacher	Language
Hemingway, Ernest	A Farewell to Arms	2	Parent Parent; clergyman	Specific incidents (2)
Huxley, Aldous	Brave New World	4	Parent (4)	Language Specific incidents Vulgarity
Knowles, John	A Separate Peace	1	Other (sister)	Other ("not good literature")
Lawrence, D. H.	Sons and Lovers	1	Parent; clergyman	Suitability
Lederer, William and Burdick, Eugene	The Ugly American	2	Parent Unknown	Language Unknown
Lee, Harper	To Kill a Mockingbird	4	Student; parent Student; nat'l. org. Department chairman Principal	Language Race, religion Vulgarity Other ("too frank")
Lockridge, Ross	Raintree County	1	Principal, other admin.	Specific incidents
McCullers, Carson	The Heart is a Lonely Hunter	2	Student; parent Parent	Communism; Un-Americanism Language
Miller, Arthur	The Crucible	1	Student	Other ("sexual undertones")
Michener, James	Fires of Spring	1	Parent; clergyman	Specific incidents

TABLE XXXVIII (cont'd.)

AUTHOR	TITLE	NO.*	OBJECTOR	OBJECTION
Michener, James	Hawaii	1	Parent	Vulgarity
More, Sir Thomas	Utopia	1	Parent	Communism, leftism
O'Neill, Eugene	Ah, Wilderness!	1	Parent	Specific incidents
Orwell, George	1984	6	Parent (4) Parent; clergyman Parent; local org.	Specific incidents (2) Vulgarity (3) Suitability
Paton, Alan	Too Late the Phalarope	1	Student	Specific incidents
Rand, Ayn	The Fountainhead	1	Student; parent	Vulgarity
Salinger, J.D.	Catcher in the Rye	25	Parent (13) Department chairman (3) Principal Combination (8)	Vulgarity (12) Language (7) Specific incidents (2) Controversiality (2) Suitability Language; vulgarity
	Nine Short Stories	1	Parent	Other ("reading aloud")
Serling, Rod	Requiem for a Heavyweight	1	Another teacher	Language
Shakespeare, William	Othello	1	Parent	Race, religion
	Merchant of Venice	1	Other ("vague")	Race, religion
Shaw, George Bernard	Androcles and the Lion	1	Local organization	Race, religion

TABLE XXXVIII (cont'd)

AUTHOR	TITLE	NO.*	OBJECTOR	OBJECTION
Smith, Betty	A Tree Grows in Brooklyn	1	Other (Librarian)	Other ("too frank")
Steinbeck, John	Grapes of Wrath	3	Student Parent Department chairman	Language; specific incidents Language Controversiality
	Of Mice and Men	3	Parent Combination (2)	Language; vulgarity Language (2)
	The Moon is Down	1	Parent	Specific incidents
	The Red Pony	1	Combination	Communistic
	To A God Unknown	1	Parent	Race, religion
Twain, Mark	The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn	4	Parent Student; another tchr. Principal Member, Bd. of Ed.	Language (2) Race, religion (2)
	Mysterious Stranger	1	Clergyman	Race, religion
	The Adventures of Tom Sawyer	1	Student; another tchr.	Language
West, Morris	The Devil's Advocate	1	Student; parent	Race, religion
Wilde, Oscar	Picture of Dorian Gray	1	Department chrmn.; other teachers	Suitability
Wouk, Herman	The Caine Mutiny	1	Parent	Specific incidents

TABLE XXXVIII (cont'd.)

AUTHOR	TITLE	NO.*	OBJECTOR	OBJECTION
Hedde, Wilhelmina G. and Others	American Speech	1	Parent; newspapermen	Communism, leftism
Loban, Walter	Adventures in Reading	1	Parent	Communism, leftism
Tressler, Jacob	English in Action, III	1	National organization	Un-Americanism
Hemingway, Ernest	"All of his works"	1	Other (Librarian)	Other ("corruptive")
________	The Book of Job	1	Student; principal	Other ("teaching religion in public school")
________	Harcourt Brace Literature Series	1	Local organization	Communism, leftism
________	"Frankie and Johnny"	1	Parent	Language
________	Special unit: Ugly American; Mouse That Roared; On the Beach; Profiles in Courage	1	Parent	Un-Americanism

---

*Number of objections to the particular work.

APPENDIX F

TABLE XXXIX

CENSORED BOOKS: DATE OF PUBLICATION NATIONALITY OF AUTHOR

Author	Title	Date of Publication	Nationality of Author
Bernstein et al	West Side Story	1958	American
Buck	The Good Earth	1931	American
Budd	April Snow	1951	
Burdick, Wheeler	Fail-Safe	1962	American
Cervantes	Don Quixote	1615	Spanish
Clark	Ox-Bow Incident	1940	American
Crane	The Red Badge of Courage	1895	American
DelCastillo	Child of Our Time	1958	
Dos Passos	U.S.A.	1937	American
DuMaurier	Rebecca	1938	English
Fast	April Morning	1961	American
Faulkner	Light in August	1932	American
Ferber	Cimarron	1929	American
Fielding	Tom Jones	1749	English
Fitzgerald	Great Gatsby	1925	American
Frank	Diary of a Young Girl	1952	Dutch
Golding	Lord of the Flies	1954	English
Griffin	Black Like Me	1961	American
Guthrie	The Way West	1949	American

TABLE XXXIX (cont'd.)

Author	Title	Date of Publication	Nationality of Author
Hawthorne	Scarlet Letter	1850	American
Heggen	Mister Roberts	1946	American
Hemingway	A Farewell to Arms	1929	American
Huxley	Brave New World	1932	English
Knowles	A Separate Peace	1960	American
Lawrence	Sons and Lovers	1913	English
Lederer and Burdick	The Ugly American	1958	American
Lee	To Kill A Mockingbird	1960	American
Lockridge	Raintree County	1948	American
McCullers	The Heart is a Lonely Hunter	1940	American
Michener	Fires of Spring Hawaii	1949 1959	American
Miller	The Crucible	1953	American
More	Utopia	1516	English
O'Neill	Ah, Wilderness!	1933	American
Orwell	1984	1949	English
Paton	Too Late the Phalarope	1953	S. African
Rand	The Fountainhead	1943	American
Salinger	Catcher in the Rye Nine Short Stories	1951 1953	American
Serling	Requiem for a Heavyweight	1962	American
Shakespeare	Merchant of Venice Othello	1600 1622	English
Shaw	Androcles and the Lion	1912	Irish

TABLE XXXIX (cont'd.)

Author	Title	Date of Publication	Nationality of Author
Smith	A Tree Grows in Brooklyn	1943	American
Steinbeck	To A God Unknown	1933	American
	Of Mice and Men	1937	
	The Red Pony	1938	
	Grapes of Wrath	1939	
	The Moon is Down	1942	
Twain	Huckleberry Finn	1884	American
	Tom Sawyer	1876	
	Mysterious Stranger	1916	
West	The Devil's Advocate	1959	Australian
Wilde	The Picture of Dorian Gray	1891	English
Wouk	The Caine Mutiny	1951	American

APPENDIX G

TABLE XXXX

CENSORED BOOKS: INCLUSION IN RECOMMENDED READING LISTS

Author	Title	NCTE*	Wilson**	ALA***
Bernstein et al	West Side Story			
Buck	The Good Earth	x	x	x
Budd	April Snow			
Burdick, Wheeler	Fail-Safe		x	
Cervantes	Don Quixote	x	x	x
Clark	Ox-Bow Incident	x		
Crane	The Red Badge of Courage	x	x	x
Del Castillo	Child of Our Time			
Dos Passos	U.S.A.			
DuMaurier	Rebecca	x	x	x
Fast	April Morning		x	x
Faulkner	Light in August			
Ferber	Cimarron	x	x	x
Fielding	Tom Jones			
Fitzgerald	Great Gatsby	x	x	x
Frank	Diary of a Young Girl	x	x	x
Golding	Lord of the Flies		x	
Griffin	Black Like Me			
Guthrie	The Way West	x	x	

TABLE XXXX (cont'd.)

Author	Title	NCTE*	Wilson**	ALA***
Hawthorne	The Scarlet Letter	x	x	x
Heggen	Mister Roberts		x	
Hemingway	A Farewell to Arms	x	x	
Huxley	Brave New World		x	
Knowles	A Separate Peace		x	x
Lawrence	Sons and Lovers			
Lederer, Burdick	The Ugly American	x	x	x
Lee	To Kill A Mockingbird		x	x
Lockridge	Raintree County			
McCullers	The Heart is a Lonely Hunter			
Miller	The Crucible	x		
Michener	Fires of Spring			
	Hawaii		x	
More	Utopia			
O'Neill	Ah, Wilderness!			
Orwell	1984	x	x	
Paton	Too Late the Phalarope			
Rand	The Fountainhead			
Salinger	Catcher in the Rye	x	x	
	Nine Short Stories		x	
Serling	Requiem for a Heavyweight			
Shakespeare	Merchant of Venice			x
	Othello			x

TABLE XXXX (cont'd.)

Author	Title	NCTE*	Wilson**	ALA***
Shaw	Androcles and the Lion		x	
Smith	A Tree Grows in Brooklyn	x	x	x
Steinbeck	Grapes of Wrath	x	x	
	Of Mice and Men		x	
	The Moon is Down		x	
	The Red Pony		x	
	To A God Unknown			
Twain	Huckleberry Finn	x	x	x
	Mysterious Stranger			
	Tom Sawyer		x	x
West	The Devil's Advocate			x
Wilde	Picture of Dorian Gray			
Wouk	The Caine Mutiny	x	x	x

---

*National Council of Teachers of English. Books for You: A List for Leisure Reading For Use by Students in Senior High Schools.

**American Library Association. A Basic Book Collection for High Schools.

***Standard Catalog for High School Libraries. Published by the H. W. Wilson Company.

APPENDIX H

CATEGORIES USED IN CODING QUESTION 28, LISTED WITH ORIGINAL RESPONSES

Language

- Profanity, swearing
- Obscene language
- Gutter language
- Indecent language
- Objectionable language
- Vulgar language
- Taking Lord's name in vain

Specific Characters, Incidents, Passages

- Concubines
- Episode between scientist and married woman
- Sexy passages
- Adult activities
- Objectionable portions or passages
- Prostitute in play
- Chapters where characters make love
- Aspects of husband/wife relationship
- Obscene situation
- Mention of sexual relations
- Beach scene
- Giving birth

Vulgarity

- Vulgar
- Immoral
- Indecent
- Obscene, obscenity
- Trashy
- Smutty
- Bawdy
- Nasty, crude
- Corrupting

Controversiality

- Fear of parental objection
- Fear of community objection

Suitability

- Difficulty
- Inappropriate
- Not fit for age group
- Unsuitable
- Adultery not fit subject for high school
- Too mature
- Some students not mature enough

Communism, Leftism

- Communistic
- Author's pink connections in 1920's
- Too many sample speeches by pinkos
- Slanted to leftist point of view
- Taught communism

Un-Americanism

- Pessimistic; encouraged un-American attitudes
- One sentence referred to world government
- Made fun of our government

Race, Religion

- Backs integration
- Anti-semitism
- Prejudice against Negroes
- Anti-Catholic
- Negro presented poorly
- Cynicism concerning fundamental Christian beliefs
- Religious content maligning Catholic Church
- Advocates disestablishment of church and state